

The *Rev. Peter Kohanik* Orthodox Catholic Review

Contents Copyrighted 1927—The Orthodox Catholic Review
Printed in U. S. A.

VOL. I

APRIL-MAY, 1927

No. IV-V

Present and Future of Orthodoxy in America in Relation to Other Bodies and to Orthodoxy Abroad

By HIS EMINENCE, AFTIMIOS, ARCHBISHOP OF BROOKLYN

The fruit of Christianity is The Faith

The fruit of The Faith is Obedience

The fruit of Obedience is Discipline

The fruit of Discipline is Prosperous Life.

—AFTIMIOS.

WITH a possible three million or even greater number of Her communicants residing in North America, the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church should be one of the major religious bodies in America. That it is not is due solely to the failure of its responsible leaders to come together as one Orthodox Catholic body for the organization of the Church in this country. Though the Orthodox Church boasts a litany in Her daily Divine Service beseeching God "for the peace of the churches and the union of them all," She is Herself in America the most outstanding horrible example of the disastrous effects of disunion, disorder, secret strife, and open warfare that this country of divided and warring sects can offer. It is true that She is at one and at peace on questions of faith, teaching, and liturgical practice. One would suppose that, therefore, She should find united ecclesiastical organization and administration an easy adjustment. It would seem that, given unity and uniformity of faith, teaching, rite, and practice, Orthodoxy in America ought to present a most edifying example of that Unity for which all Christian bodies are so loudly calling and which they are so blindly seeking. On the contrary, there is no central organization to which all the Orthodox of all racial, national, or linguistic derivation in America yield obedience. There are seven nationalities represented in American Orthodoxy, and these are divided into eighteen distinct groups

of churches without any coördinating organization, and almost without any pretense of harmony or coöperation among them. It is time that Orthodoxy in America should take serious note of the causes and effects of its divided condition, and consider the steps necessary to bring about unity and progress for the future of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church and Faith in the new world.

The foundation and development of Orthodoxy in America under the benevolent authority and guidance of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia was calculated to result in an autonomous province or autocephalous and independent American church of the Orthodox Catholic Communion. For a hundred years the Russian leadership and control over Orthodoxy in America was unquestioned, and tended steadily toward the unity and ultimate autonomy or independence of the American Province of Orthodoxy. During this time thousands of Russians, following the first Orthodox settlers in the New World, had made their homes in America; thousands of Esquimeaux, Aleuts, Indians, and other American natives had been converted by Russian Orthodox Catholic missionaries; thousands of Greeks had come to America and established communities with Churches; Serbians and Syrians had done likewise; in lesser numbers there were also Bulgarians, Albanians, Roumanians, and those various Balkan Slavic people later to be more accurately known as Czechs, Slovaks, Galicians, Croatians, Ugro-Russians, etc. Whatever their language or national origin, all these people in America looked to the Bishop or Archbishop of the existing Russian Orthodox foundation and Diocese of North America for their spiritual care and ecclesiastical administration. For them all, the Russian Bishops and Holy Synod made provision as was required. In many places several different nationalities and languages worshipped in a single congregation. When the majority of the congregation ceased to be of one language, the Russian Bishop provided, on request, a Priest of the language preferred by the majority. Special advisers and administrators were provided for various national or linguistic groups. As these groups grew in importance and membership, provision was made for Bishops of several languages or nationalities; and a plan was proposed to the Holy Synod of Russia for the organization of the American Province as an autonomous unit under a Synod of its own, representing all the groups in America and governing all Orthodoxy in this country. The late Patriarch Tikhon when Archbishop of the North American Province laid this plan before the Russian Holy Synod. Unfortunately for the Church in America, there was a change in administration, and in Russian Church affairs at home, before this was put into effect. The transfer of Archbishop Tikhon from America to Russia in 1907, the World War, the Russian Revolution and subsequent collapse, and the shortsighted and misguided patriotism and ambitions of the various groups and leaders in America, have destroyed the work that had been done for a united and autonomous American Orthodox Church.

The World War and the triumph of the slogan of Democracy, "Self-determination," fanned into destructive flame that smoldering but ever superabundant nationalism in the Eastern Orthodox people which, with

unconscious irony, the Patriarchate of Constantinople has condemned as the new heresy of philetism—love of one's race or nationality above the love and obedience due to Holy Church and Her interests and canons. Each little group or tribe now aspired to become a distinct nation, and each nationalistic party determined to have a separate and distinct national Orthodox Church or, indeed, a Patriarchate. This brought confusion and disorder enough in the Church in Europe where new or revived states sprang into existence; but its reaction on the Orthodox population of America where there was no corresponding political development to justify or excuse new ecclesiastical organizations, was chaotic and disastrous. Each little group of Orthodox people produced some new party or leader who wished to set up in America a Church based solely on the national or racial derivation of its adherents. The inclusive unity and coördination of Orthodoxy as such in America regardless of nationality or language was forgotten in this sudden over-emphasis upon political or tribal distinctions based upon the reorganization of the map of Europe. The true ideal of one Orthodox Catholic Church in America for the growing thousands of Americans born and reared in Orthodoxy was lost in the over-zealous patriotic desire of the immigrant generation to parallel in America the national resurrections taking place in Europe. The situation was most favorable for ambitious and self-seeking ecclesiastical adventurers and politicians, and these appeared in every group.

With a strong and well supported administration the Russian Archdiocese might have maintained and developed the united federation of American Orthodoxy planned and begun under Archbishop Tikhon. Unfortunately, the strength and support of the Russian Administration of Orthodox America was suddenly and completely cut off by the Russian Revolution and by the disruption of the Russian Church at home. Not organized to be self-sustaining, the Church in America was unprepared for the collapse of the prestige and financial support of the Russian Mother Church. Discipline, order, and unity became most difficult of preservation in the face of the nationalistic agitation and factional strife in politically divided groups.

The internal difficulties tending to disrupt and divide Orthodoxy in America have been powerfully aided and increased by the relations with other religious bodies in this country. Every separation of a national group from the rest of Orthodoxy in America, every schism and division, every uncanonical intrusion and disturbance that has broken American Orthodoxy into discordant and warring factions has been assisted and abetted directly or indirectly by the unfortunate and misguided zeal of non-Orthodox, Protestant bodies whose friendly but misdirected assistance has invariably resulted in loss to Orthodoxy. Leaders of the Orthodox Catholic Church have defied the Canons and set at naught the Fathers and Councils of the Undivided Catholic Church in order to fraternize illegally with Protestant heresy and secure the help of Protestant bodies. The only result has been the further distress and division of Orthodoxy. Obviously, it is time for intermeddling between Orthodoxy and Protestantism to cease, if Holy Church is not to suffer still further. Already seven severe and disgraceful troubles resulting

in great loss to Orthodoxy have been directly caused or greatly aided by the illicit and uncanonical activity of Protestants within Orthodox affairs. All of these disastrous divisions in American Orthodoxy have been connected with the activities of Episcopalians—two of them with those of Methodist Episcopalians, and five with Protestant Episcopalians. Other Protestant bodies have not interfered with our internal affairs in America. And, to be accurate, it must be admitted that the Methodist Episcopal activity has been unofficial and on the part of only a small party led by a single bishop in that body, whereas the actions of the Protestant Episcopal Church have been those of that body's official representatives and National Council.

The Methodist Episcopal Bishop Blake, supported by *Zion's Herald*, has contributed markedly to the difficulties of the Orthodox Church both here and in Russia by his support of the Living Church and other schismatic Russian movements that seek the destruction of the Russian Patriarchate. In America the supporters of Bishop Blake and the *Zion's Herald* party of Methodists have actively supported John Kedrovsky, the uncanonical intruder who represents the reformed bodies of the Bolshevik Soviet Russian régime and seeks to obtain the property and control of the Orthodox Church in America.

Although in supporting the Living Church and the divisions under the Soviet régime Bishop Blake protested that neither he nor his supporters wished to proselytize from the Russian Orthodox Church, the second source of trouble which their activities have given us is distinctly a case of militant proselytization in America. The Reverend Charles Mrzena, a Czecho-Slovak Priest ordained by the Patriarch of Serbia, was induced to agree to work under the direction and authority of the Methodist Board of Home Missions under the mutual understanding that neither he nor his people should become Methodists but that the Methodists would help them to remain Orthodox. The Methodists professed their readiness to do this merely as a means of preventing the return to Roman obedience of those Czecho-Slovaks who had broken away from the Roman Catholic Church. But, when the time came for the appointment of Father Mrzena and his assistants, Bishop Blake and the New Jersey Conference over which he presided suddenly discovered that the only way to make good the promised support was first to insist that the Orthodox Priest become a Methodist preacher and be "ordained" such by Methodist parsons. It has happened, therefore, that Bishop Blake and the Methodists have "ordained" an Orthodox Catholic Priest to be a special missionary for the Methodists to his fellow nationals in America. This has finally destroyed a once promising Orthodox Catholic Czecho-Slovak work.

Apparently devoid of all sense of the humorous or ridiculous in its position, the Protestant Episcopal Church has always assumed a patronizing and paternally indulgent attitude towards all Catholic and Orthodox Churches in America. With Old Catholics, Protestant Episcopalians have claimed to be the only true and rightful Old Catholic Church in America. With Orthodox, they claim to be the proper Orthodox Church in English and to have a superior jurisdiction over all the real Orthodox in America. With Protestants of all sorts they seek union on terms of

mutual recognition and ordination as the true Protestant Church of America. This comprehensive "all things to all men" attitude of the Protestant Episcopal Church as regards Orthodox bodies found expression in one of their General Convention reports in the statement for the Protestant Episcopal Church that, "We might claim that we (the Episcopalian Protestants!) are the original Orthodox body in this country holding jurisdiction, and that all the others who come are simply our welcome guests whom we are pleased to befriend and aid in ministering to people of their own church, race and language." Were it only stated, such a position would be merely ludicrous; for certainly the Protestant Episcopal Church, not being Orthodox Catholic in any sense, could not possibly be "the original Orthodox body in this country," nor could it hold any jurisdiction over or for Orthodox people, nor yet could it possibly minister, or aid in ministering validly or properly, to Orthodox Catholic faithful communicants. But when the Protestant Episcopalians take this position seriously and presume to act upon it, and to induce our people and clergy to accept such position and actions under an erroneous and misleading propaganda, the results are dangerous to the souls and salvation of our people, and to the unity, peace, and welfare of God's Holy Churches. Ready at all times and in every proper and canonical manner to promote the unity of all Christians in the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ, Orthodoxy and Orthodox Prelates can not lawfully or properly lend their aid or influence to false and deceptive pretensions of unity where there is and can be no unity or coördination between the heretical Protestantism of the Episcopalians and the true Catholicity of the Orthodox.

In 1922 the Protestant Episcopal Church with the approval of its General Convention, began through its Foreign-Born Americans Division of the Department of Missions and Church Extension of its National Council a definite policy of promoting and aiding divisions and schisms in the Orthodox Church in America, provided that these broken parts of Orthodoxy would enter into communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church and accept its Protestant Bishops. One of the official statements of this policy issued by the Foreign-Born Division is as follows: "A policy for promoting and fostering these National Churches under our Bishops and in communion with the Episcopal Church has been started and is in operation as approved by the General Convention." It is in the pursuance of this policy that five most injurious and serious divisions, greatly troubling American Orthodoxy, have been fostered or promoted by the activity of the agents of the Protestant Episcopal Church through its Foreign-Born Division under the direction of Messrs. Burgess and Emhardt, Secretary and Field Director, respectively, of that bureau of propaganda.

(1) Previous to 1922 all the Orthodox people in America from the Balkan and Slav districts of Europe were admittedly and officially under the direction of the Orthodox Jurisdiction in this country established and maintained by the Russian Archdiocese. In that year, under the invitation and auspices of the Protestant Episcopal Church and entirely unknown to the proper Orthodox Catholic Bishops and Authorities in

America, Bishop Gorazd Pavlik, a Roman Catholic Priest who had left the Roman obedience at the height of the nationalistic fervor to head a National Czecho-Slovak Church and had been consecrated Bishop by the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch, came to America. He was taken to the Protestant Episcopal General Convention by Messrs. Emhardt and Burgess, and during his stay in America was under the constant tutelage of their assistant, Mr. Robert Keating Smith, who as a paid staff-worker of the Division of Foreign-Born was assigned to guide and assist Bishop Gorazd in his travels and activity in America. As a result of this benevolent guidance, Bishop Gorazd did not consult with the Orthodox Catholic authorities exercising canonical jurisdiction over the Slavic and Balkan people in America. On the contrary, disregarding these entirely, he was persuaded to make a formal concordat with the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church and to turn over the newly-organized Czecho-Slovak Orthodox Church to the Protestant Bishops and to the communion of the Episcopalians, on the ignorant and misinformed assumption that the dogmatic standards and foundation of the Protestant Episcopal Church were the same as those of the Orthodox. When this concordat was announced, the official organ of the Russian Orthodox Archdiocese immediately condemned it in a leading article, declaring that if this new Czecho-Slovak National Church had the same dogmatic standards and foundation as the Protestant Episcopal, and found union and communion under Protestant Bishops possible, then certainly it was no part of the Orthodox Catholic Church and communion of Faith.

(2) But the deflection from Orthodox Catholic jurisdiction and sacramental communion on the part of the Czecho-Slovaks was not the only destruction that the Protestant Episcopal Church accomplished through Bishop Gorazd Pavlik. A small disorderly party of Russians were contesting the regular and accepted Russian Church Authority in America. While in this country under the shepherding of Messrs. Emhardt, Burgess and Keating Smith, Bishop Gorazd joined with this schismatic and uncanonical faction and took part in an uncanonical consecration of Adam Phillipovsky as a Bishop for the disgruntled faction of Carpatho-Russian and other minor groups. As I shall point out later, the parishes originally adhering to this man were subsequently turned over to a certain Protestant Episcopal Roman Catholic Jew, John Török, sometime an employee of the Department of Foreign-Born, who was sent to Bishop Gorazd Pavlik in Europe to be consecrated. Adam Phillipovsky himself has caused no end of trouble and dissension in the Orthodox Church since he was consecrated by this ally of the Protestant Episcopalians.

(3) In 1923, in accordance with an arrangement made by Mr. Emhardt with the Patriarch of Antioch, but without reference to the Syrian Archbishop and clergy in America, the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church secured under the direction and authority of its Foreign-Born Division a paid "missionary to the unchurched Syrians in America." The chief difference between this action and that of the Methodist Episcopal Board of Home Missions in securing a missionary to Czecho-Slovaks as noted above lies in the fact that the

Protestant Episcopal Church was not so sure of the necessity or sufficiency of its own orders for such ministrations under its authority, and therefore asked the Patriarch of Antioch to have the missionary Ordained instead of "ordaining" him anew themselves in any case as did the Methodists. Unfortunately, there was a division among the Syrian Orthodox in this country, and the activity of this special missionary of the Protestant Episcopalians, who was supposed to go to those Syrians who had no resident clergy, was almost entirely confined to visiting those localities in which both factions existed, or in which it was possible to stir up agitation against the resident parish Priest of the Syrian Archdiocese. This "missionary" Antony Bachir, under the direction of Messrs. Emhardt and Burgess, made every effort to subvert the faithful of the Syrian Mission and Archdiocese of Brooklyn from their canonical obedience and rightful communion. Owing to the vigorous protests of loyal Syrians and the exposing of the entire Protestant Episcopal activity in Syrian newspapers, this attempt was unsuccessful; and the salary of Antony Bachir as special missionary was discontinued at the end of a year by the Protestant Episcopal National Council. However, the effects of this fomenting of internal strife and division in the Syrian Orthodox in America by a bought and paid Syrian Orthodox agent of the Episcopalians will not be erased for many years. It is fortunate that the hundred thousand dollars promised for the Patriarchate of Antioch out of the expected Holy Places Fund was not obtained and that there was no formal action taken by Antioch on Anglican Orders such as was taken by Jerusalem.

(4) Until 1923 the Roumanian Orthodox congregations in America had always been under the Russian Archdiocese whose authority was exercised through a Roumanian Archimandrite as administrator for his fellow nationals in this country. In that year, however, under the benevolent chairmanship of Field Director Emhardt of the Foreign-Born Americans Division of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in church buildings most kindly lent for the occasion by the Protestant Episcopal rector, a number of Roumanian Orthodox representatives met in Pittsburgh without the knowledge, or participation, or authority, of the Russian Archdiocese. In documents this meeting acknowledged that the Roumanian Orthodox Priests in America derive authority and jurisdiction from the Russian Archdiocese in this country, even though they received spiritual authority in Roumania from the Bishops of the Roumanian Holy Synod. Yet, under the kindly auspices and able chairmanship so generously provided by the Protestant Episcopal Church through Mr. Emhardt, this meeting determined to "turn to the Bishops of the Episcopal Church for ecclesiastical protection and discipline" over an autonomous Roumanian Orthodox Church in America and passed the following resolution:

"Resolved that the National Council of the Episcopal Church be requested, until such time as an ecclesiastical hierarchy be established in America, to request the Bishops (of the Protestant Episcopal Church!) in whose dioceses are found Roumanian Orthodox Churches to take the Priests and congregations of such Churches under their ecclesiastical

protection, assuming responsibility for discipline of Priests and congregations, and performing such episcopal acts as from time to time shall be requested by the Holy Synod of the Roumanian Orthodox Church."

Of course such an act on the part of the Roumanian committee passing this resolution could have no canonical or binding force, but it did necessarily create great confusion and separate many from the unity of the Orthodox Communion. It well illustrates the danger and the disastrous results of Orthodox clergy and faithful committing themselves carelessly to the intermeddling guidance of the representatives of non-Orthodox bodies.

(5) The height of audacity, and at the same time the climax of high comedy in ecclesiastical adventuring, which reads like a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta, is found in what the High Church organ of the Protestant Episcopal Church hailed widely and triumphantly as "A New Anglo-Eastern Entente." It has been noted already that Bishop Gorazd Pavlik committed himself and his Czecho-Slovak followers to the Protestant Episcopal Church, and that he participated in the uncanonical consecration of Adam Phillipovsky as Bishop for dissatisfied Carpatho-Russian parishes belonging canonically to the Russian Archdiocese in America. After these things Bishop Gorazd returned to Europe with the air and reputation of wealth, whereas he was poor before. After Bishop Gorazd arrived in Europe he sent the Reverend Charles Mrzena to America as Administrator for the Czecho-Slovak Church in this country. On arriving here, Father Mrzena started the work of building up parishes and an organization. He was not concerned with the Protestant Episcopal Church, and did not propose to place himself under the authority of Protestants on the grounds of the concordat of which he knew nothing but which the Division of Foreign-Born of the Protestant Episcopal Church insisted he should accept. When Father Mrzena persistently refused to accept either the financial subsidy or the authority of the Protestant Episcopalians, and would not present his young people to the Protestant Bishop for Confirmation and entry to the Protestant communion, agents of the Protestant Episcopal Church sought to alienate the support of his laity from him. Finally, Mr. Burgess, Secretary of the Foreign-Born Americans Division, wrote to the Immigration Authorities at Ellis Island and sought to have Father Mrzena deported on utterly false and irrelevant statements. It was after this that Father Mrzena turned to the assistance offered by the Methodists as noted above. This left some few parishes of Czecho-Slovaks with no administrator, and these entered into the "New Anglo-Eastern Entente." Along with them entered also the Carpatho-Russian parishes of Adam Phillipovsky, who, losing his legal fight for control of the Russian Church, retired to Canada for a brief stay after spending a month in jail for contempt of court. But Adam Phillipovsky gave his approval for these parishes to follow in the steps of his consecrator, Bishop Gorazd, and come under the control and guidance of Protestant Episcopal agents.

The central character in this "New Anglo-Eastern Entente" is a certain Hungarian named John W. Török. Born and reared a Jew, Török became a Roman Catholic Uniate in 1906 and was ordained Priest

in the Roman obedience in 1914. During the war he became notorious as a political agitator, and in 1920 came to America for political reasons. After some difficulties with the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, Father Török left the Roman Church and was received into the Protestant Episcopal communion. He was employed as a special assistant to Mr. Burgess, Secretary of the Foreign-Born Americans Division of the Department of Missions. After a short period of teaching in a Protestant Episcopal college, he appeared to become a parish rector of a very small Protestant Episcopal congregation in Wisconsin. Two years later, in 1924, Török was called from his obscure parish by his "election" as Bishop, simultaneously, by the Czecho-Slovaks under the Protestant Episcopal Foreign-Born Americans Division, and by the Carpatho-Russian parishes under Adam Phillipovsky whom the Czecho-Slovak Bishop Gorazd had consecrated. The supposed "conventions" of these two groups were held in Pittsburgh, and represented only the few parishes in that vicinity under the influence of Protestant Episcopal propaganda. It is a significant fact that both these "electing bodies," though willing that their new Bishop-elect should remain in Protestant Episcopal communion, were convinced that Protestant Episcopal Orders were insufficient or inadequate for the ministry they wished Török to undertake. Neither proposed that he be consecrated by Protestant Episcopal Bishops, but both insisted that he receive Orthodox Catholic Consecration, and courteously invited his own Protestant diocesan Bishop to accompany Török to Serbia to participate in this consecration.

Török was consecrated Bishop, not in Serbia but in Vienna, in October, 1924. He maintained that he was not leaving the Protestant Episcopal Church nor abandoning its dogmatic position in receiving this consecration. The Protestant diocesan, Bishop Weller of Fond du Lac (whom generally current and undenied report credits with having been secretly reconsecrated by an Old Catholic Bishop after his consecration by Protestant Episcopal Bishops), did not go to Europe for the ceremony, thinking it wiser that the consecration should be by Orthodox only. The order for the consecration was not given by any Orthodox Synod or Patriarch but by the Serbian Bishop Dositej of Nish, whose action was without the knowledge or authorization of the Patriarch of Serbia, and was immediately repudiated and disclaimed by that Authority on its being questioned by the Russian Archdiocese. The consecrators were Bishop Gorazd Pavlik, already committed to the Protestant communion, and Bishop Dositej, who had been one of the participating Bishops at the consecration of Gorazd. This most anomalously consecrated and constituted Bishop then returned to America where the facts concerning him were already current. The people who supposedly had elected him for their Bishop refused to accept him on learning who and what he was. No Orthodox people or Clergy would recognize him. The "New Anglo-Eastern Entente" collapsed. "Bishop" Török retired to Florida to sell real estate. The parishes he was to have been Bishop over are scattered and broken up into purely congregational independent units without any Bishop, and are cut off from all Orthodox jurisdiction.

Such are the results of the illicit and uncanonical intermeddlings

between Orthodox Catholics and Protestants. These are only a few of the outstanding instances of loss and disgraceful trouble to the Church, and danger to the souls of the faithful of Orthodoxy, that occur constantly in consequence of Orthodox Prelates and Clergy unlawfully permitting the alien hands of Protestants to interfere in Orthodox Catholic affairs. The letters and documents on these and other cases are full of instructive warning of the increasing gravity of the danger to American Orthodoxy in such relations. Surely it is not necessary that Orthodox groups in America should go outside their own Catholic Faith and Church to seek help from Protestant bodies and alliance with them. A united American Orthodoxy would have sufficient numbers and strength to care adequately for all the needs of every Orthodox group in this country. Is it not the plain duty of our people and Prelates to unite into one Orthodox Catholic Church and Synod for all Orthodoxy in America? Most of our people will agree that it is. It only remains for our Prelates to act.

The consideration of a united Orthodox Catholic Church in America under its own Synod representing and governing all the Orthodox groups in this country at once raises the question of what the relations of Orthodoxy in America would then be to Orthodoxy abroad. The solution of this problem must be such as to promote the general good of Orthodoxy, especially in America. At the same time, it must not be such as would directly contravene the Sacred Canons and Traditional Practice of Holy Church in Her administration and discipline. Further, it must be practically workable and applicable in the face of the present situation in Orthodoxy both in America and abroad. In order to elucidate such a plan, we must consider Orthodox conditions abroad in their relation to America, and the Practice and Canons of the Church in the light of present necessities and circumstances.

Orthodoxy in America, unlike that in any previously existing Orthodox Province, is made up of people of all languages and from all political, racial, and ecclesiastical allegiances within the Church. It is not a homogeneous body of people of one language, race, or nation. Only two things are common to all Orthodox in America—the fact of their Orthodox Faith, and their residence in this country. In other particulars their interests, thought, feelings, and prejudices are diverse and, too often, mutually antagonistic. It is not practical for all of them to be under the discipline and authority of Bishops of any one foreign Orthodox national Church. Aside from the difficulty of a multiplicity of languages and dialects, the racial and national prejudices and antagonisms are too strongly felt to make such an existence harmonious. Furthermore, no foreign national Church is in a position to undertake effective administration of the Church in America. In every National Church abroad Orthodoxy is either divided and crippled in its administration, or is just emerging from the pre-war conditions and beginning to face new problems that will take all Her energy and attention for years to come. Nor could the peculiar situations incident to American conditions be dealt with intelligently by absentee government. These facts seem to preclude the possibility of American Orthodoxy coming under any one foreign national jurisdiction. Yet the existence of numerous overlapping and interpenetrating jurisdictions in the same territory is canonically impossible and illegal.

What, then, is the canonically lawful and proper jurisdiction of Orthodoxy in America? To this there are three different answers, each supported by a respectable weight of Orthodox opinion and authority. It is quite unlikely that all Orthodoxy in America or abroad will ever agree on any one of them. They arise out of the fact that the history and situation of America is without precedent, and had no parallel in the period when the Apostolic and Conciliar determinations for the guidance of the Church were developed. The first is that of the Russians, who claim exclusive American jurisdiction by virtue of evangelization and hierarchical establishment maintained in this territory for three times the canonical thirty years without dispute or rival. This, by the authority or application of the second canon of the Second Œcumenical Council, and the seventeenth canon of the Fourth, and the hundred twentieth canon of Carthage, should give exclusive and permanent American jurisdiction to Russia. To my own mind, it is the strongest claim canonically and historically. The second claim to canonical jurisdiction over America for all the Orthodox is that of the Greeks of the Phänär, and of those who support the claims of Constantinople. This asserts that America falls within the *diaspora*—the scattered and barbarian territory not assigned to any of the ecclesiastical divisions of the Empire of Conciliar days, but ascribed to the general care and protection of Constantinople as Œcumenical Patriarchate. It would seem that the actual holding of American Jurisdiction by Russia in accordance with the canons cited would dispose of this claim—that America thereby ceased to be of the *diaspora* when for thirty years Constantinople made no claim. But it is not likely that many Greeks nor the Phänär canonists will take this view. The matter remains deadlocked between Russians and Greeks. The third view of the question is designed to brush aside both the others in favor of the theory that no precedent or Conciliar Prescription applies to the facts of the American situation. America was not then in the knowledge of the Church and Her Councils. America is not *diaspora* in the sense of the Canons and practice of the Church. America is not borderland territory between or on the edge of rival or adjacent jurisdictions. America is not primarily or to any great extent a territory evangelized or converted by Orthodoxy; it is chiefly a land into which Orthodox groups from all the existing Patriarchates and National Churches have moved and where they have established communities in the midst of an unchanged pagan or heretical environment. No such land as this was thought of or provided for in the formulation of the Canons and Practice of the Church. There is, therefore, no basis on which any National Church can claim exclusive jurisdiction and each Church is free to establish its own American Jurisdiction. This last seems to offer a solution, but the fact remains that overlapping or interpenetrating jurisdictions where two or more Bishops administer the same territory are not permissible under the Canons. Canonically, then, there is no answer to the problem at once strictly correct and also practically applicable to the situation unless American Orthodoxy be independently organized and dispose Her own affairs by Her own Synod's application of Canonical practice to each separate problem.

Would such an American Synod for all Orthodoxy in this country meet the needs of future growth and development of the Church in America and benefit Orthodoxy at large? More than half the Orthodox in America today are the American reared and educated children of the Orthodox immigrants. These young people and their children are to be

the Orthodox of America tomorrow. They know little and care less about the racial and national prejudices and jurisdictional quarrels of Europe. Those things are very foreign and strange to their American training and interests. A Church that bases its claim to their membership and allegiance on the language, nationality, or racial prejudices of their grandfathers will mean nothing to them. They rightly demand a Church that is concerned primarily with their own conditions and problems in America rather than with the politics of the Balkans, Greece, Russia, or Syria. That an American Church should include all those nationalities on the common basis of their Orthodoxy and American residence is natural and fitting. That it should then look to some foreign national church for the government and jurisdiction over them all as Americans is absurd, unnecessary, and most embarrassingly inconvenient. The formation of an American Synod of Orthodoxy would meet the natural and proper expectation and demand of the American children who are to be the Church of the future.

But an American Synod of United Orthodoxy in this country would do much more than merely meet the naturally expected course of development of the Church in America. Given the support of any considerable portion of the various groups, it would be able to maintain a position of authority and dignity that would secure some adequate discipline and order in American Orthodoxy. It would be able to found and support Orthodox schools and theological seminaries for the training of American Orthodox youth in their own Faith and for the Priesthood of their own Church. Such seminaries and schools could prepare clergy and teachers to meet the American need for trained men in the Church who can use any one of the several Orthodox liturgical languages as well as English. Ultimately the union and development of American Orthodoxy would enable us to send teachers and help back to the despoiled and impoverished homelands of the Church in Europe and the Near East.

The prime necessity for Orthodoxy in America and at large today is to bury the causes of Her divisions and set forth anew on a road of peaceful and united progress for the good of Holy Church and the Kingdom of Christ. Orthodox Catholic Bishops and leaders should come together in the spirit of the love and the humility of their Master, and sacrifice themselves and their personal or nationalistic ambitions to the cause of their Church and their God. No more should they seek to secure the support of those outside the One Fold of the Catholic Church and Faith, but, having full confidence and faith in their own Church and Divine Calling, they should join themselves together for the common interests of Orthodoxy and do the work that has been committed to their trust in America and elsewhere. The very survival and future existence of Orthodoxy depends on the rapid and firm organization and development of the Orthodox Catholic Church as one unified body in America. The safety and salvation of thousands of the faithful committed to our trust rests with our defense of the Church and Faith in this country and abroad from the errors and disasters of internal division and external interference and false alliance. Let the Orthodox of America unite for their common Faith and Church at all costs and begin to do the work that lies before them in this land. In spite of all obstacles the Power and Grace of God in our Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church can prevail.

✠ AFTIMIOS,
Archbishop of Brooklyn.

The Nine Commandments of the Orthodox Catholic Church to All Faithful Christians

I. Attend the Services of the Orthodox Catholic Church on Sundays and Feast Days: Matins and Vespers as well as Divine Liturgy should be heard and Religious Instruction received.

II. Keep the required four fasts each year.

III. Pay proper reverence to the Priests and especially to your own Father Confessor.

IV. Make Penitential Confession to a Priest of Orthodox Catholic Ordination and Authority in order to receive Absolution and Communion at least four times each year.

V. Keep away from all heretics and schismatics; neither pray with them nor attend their religious meetings or services.

VI. Pray God constantly and always for His mercy upon every estate of man.

VII. Observe such Fasts, Prayers, Services, and Regulations as the Orthodox Catholic Bishop over you may appoint.

VIII. Guard, preserve, support and contribute to the welfare, honor, and property of the Holy Orthodox Catholic Church and of your local church in particular.

IX. Refrain from celebrating marriage at forbidden times or with forbidden persons.

Composed in varying forms from the Sacred Canons by various Orthodox Catechists but most notably by Peter Mogila and Nicolas Bulgaris.

Pastoral Direction and Instruction on Orthodox and Protestant Episcopal Relations and Ministrations in America

Definition of Status of Anglican Communion and Strict Prohibition of All Orthodox Acceptance of Protestant Ministrations of Any Sort Is Still in Force in America, as Given by Late Bishop Raphael of Brooklyn, First Orthodox Bishop Consecrated in This Country.

HIS Grace, the Right Reverend Raphael Hawaweeny, late Bishop of Brooklyn and head of the Syrian Greek Orthodox Catholic Mission of the Russian Church in North America, was a far-sighted leader and founder of Orthodoxy in America. A Syrian by birth and using the Arabic as his mother tongue but Russian by education and training as well as ecclesiastical allegiance, Bishop Raphael was, first of all, Orthodox Catholic and American in his life work. Called from Russia to New York in 1895 to assume charge of the growing Syrian parishes under the Russian jurisdiction over American Orthodoxy, Archimandrite Hawaweeny was elevated to the episcopate by order of the Holy Synod of Russia and consecrated Bishop of Brooklyn and Head of the Syrian Mission by Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Innocent of Alaska on March 12, 1904. This was the first consecration of an Orthodox Catholic Bishop in the New World and Bishop Raphael was the first Orthodox Prelate to spend his entire Episcopate from consecration to burial, in America. His remains lie in the Syrian Orthodox section of Mount Olivet Cemetery, Brooklyn, where it is proposed to erect a Memorial Chapel over the grave of the first Orthodox Bishop consecrated and buried in America.

With his broad culture and international training and experience Bishop Raphael naturally had a keen interest in the universal Orthodox aspiration for Christian unity. His work in America, where his Syrian communities were widely scattered and sometimes very small and without the services of the Orthodox Church, gave him a special interest in any movement which promised to provide the way by which acceptable and valid sacramental ministrations might be brought within the reach of isolated Orthodox Catholic people. It was, therefore, with real pleasure and gratitude that Bishop Raphael received the habitual approaches of "High Church" prelates and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Assured by "catholic-minded" Protestants, seeking the recognition of real Catholic Bishops, that the Anglican Communion and Protestant Episcopal Church were really Catholic and almost the same as Orthodox, Bishop Raphael was filled with great happiness. A group of these "High Episcopalian" Protestants had formed the American branch of "The Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union" (since revised and now existing as "The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association," chiefly active in England, where it publishes a quarterly organ called "The Christian East"). This organization, being well pleased with

the impression its members had made upon Bishop Raphael, elected him Vice-President of the Union. Bishop Raphael accepted, believing that he was associating himself with truly Catholic but unfortunately separated fellow Priests and Bishops in a movement that would promote Orthodoxy and true Catholic Unity at the same time.

As is their usual custom with all prelates and clergy of other bodies, the Protestant Episcopal Bishops urged Bishop Raphael to recognize their Orders and accept for his people the sacramental ministrations of their Protestant clergy on a basis of equality with the Sacraments of the Orthodox Church administered by Orthodox Catholic Priests. It was pointed out that the isolated and widely-scattered Orthodox who had no access to Orthodox Catholic Priests or Sacraments could be easily reached by clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who, they persuaded Bishop Raphael to believe, were true Priests and Orthodox in their doctrine and belief though separated in organization. In this pleasant delusion, but under carefully specified conditions and restrictions, Bishop Raphael issued in 1910 permission for his faithful, in emergencies and under necessity when Orthodox Catholic Priests and Sacraments were inaccessible, to ask the ministrations of Protestant Episcopal clergy and make comforting use of what these clergy could provide in the absence of Orthodox Catholic Priests and Sacraments.

Being a Vice-President on the Eastern Orthodox Catholic side of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union and having issued on Protestant Episcopal solicitation such a permission to his people, Bishop Raphael set himself to observe most closely the resulting acts following upon his permissory letter and to study most carefully the Protestant Episcopal Church and Anglican teaching in the hope that the Anglicans might really be capable of becoming actually Orthodox. But the more closely he observed the general practice and the more deeply he studied the teaching and faith of the Protestant Episcopal Church the more painfully shocked, disappointed, and disillusioned Bishop Raphael became. Furthermore, the very fact of his own position in the Anglican and Orthodox Union made the confusion and deception of Orthodox people the more certain and serious. The existence and cultivation of even friendship and mutual courtesy was pointed out as supporting the Protestant Episcopal claim to Orthodox Catholic sacramental recognition and intercommunion. Bishop Raphael found that his association with Episcopalians was made the basis for a most insidious, injurious, and unwarranted propaganda in favor of the Protestant Episcopal Church among his parishes and faithful. Finally, after more than a year of constant and careful study and observation, Bishop Raphael felt that it was his duty to resign from the association of which he was a Vice-President. In doing this he hoped that the end of his connection with the Union would end also the Protestant Episcopal interferences and uncalled-for intrusions in the affairs and religious harmony of his people. His letter of resignation from the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union, published in the Russian Orthodox Messenger, Feb. 18, 1912, stated his convictions in the following way:

"I have a personal opinion about the usefulness of the Union. Study has taught me that there is a vast difference between the doctrine, discipline, and even worship of the Holy Orthodox Church and those of the Anglican Communion; while, upon the other hand, experience has forced upon me the conviction that to promote courtesy and friendship, which seems to be the only aim of the Union at present, is not only to be killing

precious time, at best, but also is somewhat hurtful to the religious and ecclesiastical welfare of the Holy Orthodox Church in these United States.

"Very many of the Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Church at the present time—and especially myself—have observed that the Anglican Communion is associated with the numerous Protestant Bodies, many of whose doctrines and teachings, as well as practices, are condemned by the Holy Orthodox Church. . . . I view union as only a pleasing dream. Indeed, it is impossible for the Holy Orthodox Church to receive—as She has a thousand times proclaimed, and as even the Papal See of Rome has declaimed to the Holy Orthodox Church's credit—anyone into Her Fold or into union with Her who does not accept Her Faith in full without any qualifications—the Faith which She claims is most surely Apostolic. I cannot see how She can unite, or the latter expect in the near future to unite with Her while the Anglican Communion holds so many Protestant tenets and doctrines, and also is so closely associated with the non-Catholic religions about Her.

"Finally, I am in perfect accord with the views expressed by His Grace, Archbishop Platon, in his address delivered this year before the Philadelphia Protestant Episcopalian Brotherhood, as to the impossibility of union under present circumstances."

One would suppose that the publication of such a letter in the official organ of the Russian Archdiocese would have ended the misleading and subversive propaganda of Protestant Episcopalians among the Orthodox Catholic faithful. But the Protestant Episcopal members simply addressed a reply to Bishop Raphael in which they attempted to make him believe that the Protestant Episcopal Church was not Protestant and had adopted none of the errors held by Protestant Bodies. For nearly another year Bishop Raphael watched and studied while the subversive Protestant Episcopal propaganda went on among his people on the basis of the letter of permission he had issued under a misapprehension of the nature and teaching of the Protestant Episcopal Church and its clergy. Seeing that there was no other means of protecting Orthodox Catholic faithful from being mislead and deceived, Bishop Raphael finally issued, late in 1912, the following Pastoral which has remained in force among the Orthodox of this jurisdiction in America ever since and has been confirmed and reinforced by the pronouncement of his successor, the present Archbishop Aftimios.

PASTORAL LETTER

To My Beloved Clergy and Laity of the Syrian Greek-Orthodox Catholic Church in North America—

Greetings in Christ Jesus, Our Incarnate Lord and God.

My Beloved Brethren:—

Two years ago, while I was a Vice-President and member of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union, being moved with compassion for my children in the Holy Orthodox faith "once and for all delivered to the Saints" (St. Jude ver. 3) scattered throughout the whole of North America and deprived of the ministrations of the Church; and especially in places far removed from Orthodox centres; and being equally moved with a feeling that the Protestant Episcopalian (Anglican) Church possessed largely the Orthodox faith, as many of the prominent clergy professed the same to me before I studied deeply their doctrinal

authorities and their liturgy—the “Book of Common Prayer”—I wrote a letter as the Bishop and Head of the Syrian Catholic Mission in North America, giving a permission, in which I said that *in extreme cases*, where no Orthodox priest could be called upon at short notice, the ministrations of the Protestant Episcopalian (Anglican) clergy might be kindly asked. However, I was *most explicit* in defining when and how the ministrations should be accepted, and also what exceptions should be made. In writing that letter I hoped, on the one hand, to help my people spiritually, and, on the other hand, to open the way toward bringing the Anglicans into the communion of the Holy Orthodox faith.

On hearing and in reading that my letter, perhaps unintentionally, was misconstrued by some of the Episcopalian (Anglican) Clergy, I wrote a second letter in which I pointed out that my instructions and exceptions had been either overlooked or ignored by many; to wit:—

(a) They informed the Orthodox people that I recognized the Anglican Communion (Protestant Episcopal Church) as being united with the Holy Orthodox Church and their ministry, that is holy orders, as valid.

(b) The Episcopalian (Anglican) Clergy *offered* their ministrations *even when my Orthodox clergy were residing in the same towns and parishes, as pastors.*

And,

(c) Protestant Episcopalian clergy said that there was *no* need of the Orthodox people seeking the ministrations of their own Orthodox priests, for their (the Anglican) ministrations were all that were necessary.

I, therefore, felt bound by all the circumstances to make a thorough study of the Anglican Church's faith and orders as well as of her discipline and ritual. After serious consideration I realized that it was *my honest duty*, as a member of the College of Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Greek Apostolic Church, and Head of the Syrian Mission in North America, to resign from the vice-presidency of and membership in the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union. At the same time, I set forth, in my letter of resignation, my reason for so doing.

I am convinced that the doctrinal teaching and practices as well as the discipline of the whole Anglican Church are unacceptable to the Holy Orthodox Church. I make this apology for the Anglicans whom as Christian gentlemen I greatly revere, that the loose teachings of a great many of the prominent Anglican theologians are so hazy in their definition of truths, and so inclined toward pet heresies that it is hard to tell what they believe. The Anglican Church as a whole has not spoken authoritatively on her doctrine. Her Catholic-minded members can cull out her doctrines from many views, but so nebulous is her pathway in the doctrinal world that those who would extend a hand of both Christian and ecclesiastical fellowship dare not, without distrust, grasp the hand of her theologians, for while many are orthodox on some points they are quite heterodox on others. I speak, of course, from the Holy Orthodox Eastern Catholic point of view. The Holy Orthodox Church has never perceptibly changed from Apostolic times, and, therefore, no one can go astray in finding out what she teaches. Like her Lord and Master, though at times surrounded with human malaria—which He in mercy pardons—she is “the same yesterday, and today, and forever” (Hebrews 8-8), the mother and safe deposit of “the truth as it is in Jesus” (Eph. IV. 21).

The Orthodox Church differs absolutely with the Anglican Communion in reference to the *number* of Sacraments and in reference to the doctrinal explanation of the same. The Anglicans say in their Catechism concerning the Sacraments that there are "two only as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, baptism and the Supper of the Lord." I am well aware that, in her two books of homilies (which are not of a binding authority for the books were only prepared in the reign of Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth for priests who were not permitted to preach their own sermons in England during times both politically and ecclesiastically perilous), she says that there are "five others commonly called Sacraments" (see homily in each book on the Sacraments), but long since she has repudiated in different portions of her Communion this very teaching and absolutely disavows such definitions in her "Articles of Religion" which are bound up in her Book of Common Prayer or Liturgy as one of her authorities.

The Orthodox Church has ever taught that there are *seven* Sacraments. She may have called them another name, yet in her definition of a Sacrament she plainly points out the fact that each of the seven has an outward and visible sign and an inward and spiritual grace, and that they are of gospel and apostolic origin.

Again, the Orthodox Church has certain ceremonies and practices associated and necessary in the administration of the Sacraments which neither time nor circumstances must set aside where Churches are organized. Yet the Anglicans entirely neglect these, though they once taught and practiced the same in more catholic days.

In the case of the administration of holy Baptism it is the absolute rule of the Orthodox Church that the candidate must be three times immersed (once in the name of each person of the Blessed Trinity). Immersion is only permissory in the Anglican Communion, and pouring or sprinkling is the general custom. The Anglicans do not use holy oil in the administration, etc., and even in doctrinal teaching in reference to this Sacrament they differ.

As to the doctrine concerning the Holy Communion the Anglican Communion has no settled view. The Orthodox Church teaches the doctrine of transubstantiation without going into any scientific or Roman Catholic explanation. The technical word which she uses for the sublime act of the priest by Christ's authority to consecrate is "Transmuting" (Liturgy of St. Chrysostom). She, as I have said, offers no explanation, but she believes and confesses that Christ, the Son of the Living God Who came into the world to save sinners, is of a truth in His "all-pure Body" and "precious Blood" (Liturgy of St. Chrysostom) *objectively* present, and to be worshipped in that Sacrament as He was on earth and is now in risen and glorified majesty in heaven; and that "the precious and holy and life-giving Body and Blood of Our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ are imparted" (to each soul that comes to that Blessed Sacrament) "Unto the remission of sins, and unto everlasting life" (Liturgy of St. Chrysostom).

Confirmation or the laying on of hands, which the Orthodox Church calls a Sacrament—"Chrismation"—in the Anglican Church is merely the laying on of hands of the Bishop accompanied by a set form of prayers, without the use of Holy Chrism, which latter has come down from Apostolic days as necessary.

Holy Matrimony is only regarded by the Anglican Communion as a

sacred rite which, even if performed by a Justice of the Peace, is regarded as sufficient in the sight of God and man.

Penance is not practiced excepting rarely in the Anglican Communion, and confession before the reception of Holy Communion is not compulsory. She has altogether set aside the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, that is anointing the sick as commanded by St. James in his General Epistle (James V. 14). To her priesthood she does not teach the true doctrine of the grace of Holy Orders. Indeed she has two forms of words for ordination, namely, one which gives the power of absolution to the priest, and the alternative form without the words of Our Lord, "whose sins ye remit," etc. (St. John XX. 23). Thus she leaves every Bishop to choose intention or non-intention in the act of ordination as to the power and grace of her priesthood (Ordination of Priests, Book of Common Prayer.)

But besides all of this, the Anglican Communion ignores the Orthodox Church's dogmas and teachings, such as the invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, special honour to the Blessed Virgin Mary the Mother of God, and reverence for sacred relics, holy pictures and ikons. She says of such teaching that it is "a foul thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God" (Article of Religion, XXII).

There is a striking variance between her wording of the Nicene Symbol and that of the Holy Orthodox Church; but sadder still, it contains the heresy of the "filioque."

I do not deem it necessary to mention all the striking differences between the Holy Orthodox Church and the Anglican Communion in reference to the authority of holy tradition, the number of General Councils, etc. Sufficient has already been said and pointed out to show that the Anglican Communion differs but little from all other Protestant bodies, and therefore, that there cannot be any intercommunion until she returns to the ancient holy Orthodox Faith and practices, and rejects Protestant omissions and commissions.

Therefore, as the official head of the Syrian Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church in North America and as one who must "give an account" (Hebrews 13-17) before the judgement throne of the "Shepherd and Bishop of Souls" (1 Peter II 25) that I have fed the "flock of God" (1 Peter V 2), as I have been commissioned by the Holy Orthodox Church, and inasmuch as the Anglican Communion (Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States) does not differ in things vital to the well being of the Holy Orthodox Church from some of the most arrant Protestant sects; I *direct* all Orthodox people residing in any community *not to seek or to accept* the ministrations of the Sacraments and rites from any clergy excepting those of the Holy Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church, for the Apostolic Canons command that the Orthodox should not commune in ecclesiastical matters with those who are not of "the same household of the Faith" (Galatians VI, 10) to wit: "Any Bishop, or presbyter or deacon who will pray with heretics let him be anathematized; and if he allowa them as clergymen to perform any service let him be deposed." (Apostolic Canon 45). "Any bishop, or presbyter who accepts baptism or the Holy Sacrifice from heretics, we order such to be deposed, for 'what concord hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?'" (Aposolic Canon 46).

As to members of the Holy Orthodox Church living in districts be-

yond the reach of Orthodox Catholic clergy *I direct* that the ancient custom of our Holy Church be observed, namely, in cases of *extreme necessity*, that is, *danger of death*, children may be baptized by some pious Orthodox layman, or even by the parent of the child, (by immersion) *three times* in the names of the (persons of the) Blessed Trinity, and in case of death such baptism is valid:—but if the child should live it must be brought to an Orthodox priest for the Sacrament of Chrismation.

In the case of the death of an Orthodox person where no priest of the holy Orthodox Church can be had, a pious layman may read over the corpse, for the comfort of the relatives and the instruction of the persons present, Psalm 90, "Whoso dwelleth under the defence of the Most High," and Psalm 118, "Blessed are those that are undefiled in the way and walk in the law," etc., and add thereto the Trisagion ("Holy God, Holy Strong One," etc.) and all that followeth. But be it noted that so soon as possible the relative must notify some Orthodox bishop or priest and request him to say the Liturgy and Requiem for the repose of the soul of the departed in his Cathedral or parish Church.

As to Holy Matrimony, if there be any parties united in wedlock outside the pale of the holy Orthodox Church because of the remoteness of Orthodox centres from their home, *I direct* that as soon as possible they either invite an Orthodox priest or go to where he resides and receive from his hands the holy Sacrament of Matrimony; otherwise they will be considered excommunicated until they submit unto the Orthodox Church's rule.

I further *direct* that Orthodox Christians should not make it a practice to attend the services of other religious bodies, so that there be no confusion as to the teaching or doctrines. Instead, I *order* that the head of each household, or a member, may read the special prayers which can be found in the hours in the Holy Orthodox Service Book, and such other devotional books as have been set forth by the authority of the Holy Orthodox Church.

Commending our clergy and laity unto the safe-keeping of Jesus Christ, and praying that the Holy Spirit may keep us all in the truth and extend the Borders of the Holy Orthodox Faith I remain,

Your affectionate Servant, in Christ,

✠ RAPHAEL,

Bishop of Brooklyn, Head of the
Syrian Greek Orthodox Catholic
Mission in North America

Accuracy of Translation and fact of the above prescriptive direction and pastoral instruction being still in force and authority, unabated and unmodified, now and for all future time in this Jurisdiction certified April 27, 1927, by

✠ AFTIMIOS,

Archbishop of Brooklyn,
First Vicar of the Russian American Jurisdiction,
Head of the Syrian Greek Orthodox Catholic Mission
in North America.

understand the Russia of the latter half of the nineteenth century, the student of today can do no better than to read and understand the works of Archbishop Nikanor of Odessa.)

WHEN I consider Divine Revelation, when I study it and turn it over in my mind, I do not find in it any direct teaching looking to the perfection of the Fine Arts—of poetry, music, painting, and sculpture. I find in it much direct teaching that enjoins the enlightening of the mind; still more that enjoins the improving of our moral nature; but I find in it almost nothing that would directly lay upon us the duty of refining our sense of the esthetic. This is a remarkable fact; for reason has assented to the custom of ascribing to the soul of man three principal powers,—Mind, Will, and Sense; and of distributing among these three powers the soul's highest activities. So knowledge and science are a necessary product of Mind, and mark out a pathway for man's progress; similarly, the fruitage of Will is laws and ethics, statutes and customs; and of Sense the Fine Arts, the gentle skills, and the striving toward refinement and elegance in the exterior bases of life. In the circle of the soul's activities, the activity of the heart has a dignity in no way inferior to the activities of Mind and Will; for the power of the heart is not inferior to the power of Mind and Will. Nay, on the contrary: the inner sense, in many connections, is to be accounted truly the principal power of the soul. Why, then, is it passed over, as it were, in Divine Revelation? Why does the Divine Revelation concern itself so exclusively with the need for the perfecting of Mind and Will, and practically disregard, to all appearances, the perfecting of Sense, our capacity for esthetic appreciation?

We find an indirect answer to this question in the following words of the Lord Jesus: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.* (St. Matthew XXII, 27-40.)

The central idea of Christian moral law is, then, regarded by Christ Himself as involving two duties in particular,—the duty of love to God, and the duty of love to one's neighbor; though, to be sure, these duties are very closely bound up with the other principal commandments laid upon us by God's law. However, those who teach the Christian moral law derive from this utterance of Our Lord not two, but three chief commandments,—love of God, love of one's neighbor, and love of one's self. Correspondingly, in moral instruction the entire compass of God's Law is expounded in grouping its requirement according to these three principal obligations: the duty to love God, the duty to love one's neighbor, and the duty to love one's self.

Love of one's self is the same as selfishness. Selfishness is a sentiment natural to us, seeing that it springs out of our nature, which was created by God. Therefore Christ does not condemn selfishness. On the contrary, He finds in it the foundation, the type, and the measure for the love one owes to his neighbor: You love yourself, love your neighbor also; and let the greatness of your natural love for yourself be the measure

also of the love you must give your neighbor. But since by reason of the sinfulness of our nature and the conditions of earthly life, selfishness tends to become exaggerated and extreme, love of self is not directly enjoined anywhere in the moral law as a duty. Nowhere in Revelation do we find the command: Love thyself. On the contrary, the prescriptions of God's Word are directed to limiting the selfishness rooted in our nature, and to warning against it, to the end that a man may not feel a love of self that will deceive and destroy him, but will rather guard the sentiment so that it may be a fertile help to himself, a benefit to his neighbor, and an open pathway for communion with God. Indeed, the perfection of the self-love that is envisaged in the Gospel is most clearly expressed in words that are most clearly opposite to the selfishness that brings ruin and degradation,—self-denial, self-surrender, and even self-negation: self-denial in one's love to his neighbor; self-surrender, surrender of one's will, of one's self-assurance, of every lust of the body, the eyes, and the pride of life, in one's love to God; self-negation, negation of the old man in self, in one's love for the high perfection that comes through the Gospel, in one's yearning for complete union with Christ, for immersion of self in His life and in His death.

What I have said thus far may serve as a point of departure for explaining the Christian attitude toward the Fine Arts.

First of all, we may remember that men well-pleasing to God and favored by Him do not estrange themselves from the Fine Arts of poetry, music, sculpture, handicrafts, and the like. Moses built a Tabernacle. David, Solomon, Ezra, Nehemiah, were builders of the Temple in Jerusalem, upon the erection and furnishing of which were lavishly spent the finest work in architecture, metallurgy, sculpture and handicrafts that their times could provide. Moses, David, Solomon, the Prophets, St. John the Divine, were poets of exalted genius. David and the other Psalmists were singers and musicians, and they fostered skill of song and music in the Temple at Jerusalem, in which Christ Himself made offering of prayer. Christ and His Apostles also loved song, and established singing in the Christian Church (First Corinthians XIV, 26). Tradition says that the Most Holy Mother of God employed Her blessed hands in the skillful artistry of needlecraft. The Holy Evangelist St. Luke according to tradition was an artist.

God Himself spoke to Moses about Bezaleel, the builder of the Tabernacle: *I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones, to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship. And I, behold, I have given with him Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan: and in the hearts of all that are wise-hearted I have put wisdom, that they may make all that I have commanded thee: the tabernacle of the congregation, and the ark of the testimony.* (Exodus XXXI, 1-7.)

So from the Word of God Himself flows the teaching that, in the end of ends as in the beginning of beginnings, the Divine Wisdom nourishes not only the understanding and wisdom of man, but also the glories of art. Accordingly, God not only blesses Art, but even Himself grants it to us. Of supreme importance everywhere and to everybody is the principle that true Art is one of God's highest gifts.

Yet, why has Divine Revelation so little to say about the progress

of the Arts? We have seen already what Christ declared to be the very foundation of the Divine Law as God has revealed it: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.* Of necessity, everything contrary to this chief commandment can have neither the blessing of God nor His command. Of necessity, everything in Art which keeps the mind, heart, and soul of man from being swallowed up in love of God is without God's blessing. Of necessity, also, anything contrary to the second great commandment of the Gospel Law, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*,—that is, anything that keeps a man from that love for his neighbor, from self-denial for the sake of that love for his neighbor,—can have, according to the Divine Revelation, neither the blessing of God nor His help. But recall to your minds for what purposes the Fine Arts were used in ancient days; and then consider whether in our day the Fine Arts are used in the spirit of the great commandments of the Moral Law requiring us to love God and to love our neighbor, or whether they are not being used rather for the satisfaction of a self-love that is untouched by a love for God.

The selfishness natural to unregenerated human nature seeks the satisfaction of being well filled, of being well dressed, of being sheltered in convenient dwellings; it disposes us to a desire to see and hear only agreeable things. From this sentiment springs most if not all of our interest in satisfying the natural necessities of the body. Next in order arise desires for the best articles of food, drink, and dress, and the best furnishings for our houses; the demand that we be surrounded by only those sights and sounds that we find agreeable; and then straightway the demands of pampered taste for luxury at table, fine clothing, magnificently furnished homes, to which demands painting, sculpture, architecture, music, drama, and every means of enjoyment are made to minister. What affinity could the Christian sentiment have with such a perversion?

Yet, from another point of view, does Christianity wholly forbid such things as impious and immoral? Certainly not! In estimating human deeds, inclinations, and feelings, Christian Moral Philosophy applies to them a scale to measure them, and grades them as things not to be allowed and to be prohibited, things tolerable and permissible, things to be approved and to be commanded, and even as things ideally beautiful. Whatever in human actions, wants, and feelings falls short of being intolerable and condemnable, Christianity merely endures and admits; it commands only that which God's law approves. But beyond what may be approved or commanded lies that which duty requires, that which is laid upon every one as an obligation—that which the heart that is warmed by love for God apprehends as the highest beauty, the ideal of supreme evangelical perfection.

Similarly in the workshops and in the practice of the Arts: That which is necessary for satisfying the demands of natural self-love is permitted and tolerated, if it does not exceed proper limits; that which encourages perfection, which advances the refinement and elevation both of fine taste and of the moral sense, is accounted blessed. But nothing is reckoned to be in harmony with the most sublime ideal unless it promotes a perfection that is holy and devout, and that completely penetrates a man's soul, heart, and mind,—his whole being,—with love toward God and with a self-denying love for his neighbor. For the Gospel of Christ

rejects everything that falls short of that ideal, exactly to the degree and to the extent of the incompleteness.

Surely, the Word of God could not be expected to encourage in us a concern for those things which Solomon very earnestly and very plainly spoke of as bringing vanity and vexation of spirit. He himself had once given his heart to the pursuit of those things which men of our own day often strive for from a mistaken idea that they are necessary or that they minister to the satisfaction of refined taste. "*I have seen,*" said Solomon in the Book of Ecclesiastes, *all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit. That which is crooked cannot be made straight; and that which is wanting cannot be numbered. I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem: yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge. And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly: I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit. For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow. I said in mine heart, Go to now, I will prove thee with mirth; therefore enjoy pleasure: and, behold, this also is vanity. I said of laughter, It is mad: and of mirth, What doeth it? I sought in mine heart to give myself unto wine, yet acquainting mine heart with wisdom; and to lay hold on folly, till I might see what was that good for the sons of men, which they should do under the heaven all the days of their life. I made me great works; I builded me houses; I planted me vineyards; I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruits: I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees: I got me servants and maidens, and had servants born in my house; also I had great possessions of great and small cattle above all that were in Jerusalem before me: I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of kings and of the provinces: I got me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts. So I was great, and increased more than all they that were before me in Jerusalem: also my wisdom remained with me. And whatsoever mine eyes desired I kept not from them, I withheld not my heart from any joy; for my heart rejoiced in all my labour: and this was my portion of all my labour. Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labour that I had laboured to do: and, behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun. And I turned myself to behold wisdom, and madness, and folly: for what can the man do that cometh after the king? even that which hath been already done. Then I saw that wisdom excelleth folly, as far as light excelleth darkness. The wise man's eyes are in his head; but the fool walketh in darkness: and I myself perceived also that one event happeneth to them all. Then said I in my heart, As it happened to the fool, so it happened even to me; and why was I then more wise? Then I said in my heart, that this also is vanity. For there is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool for ever; seeing that which now is in the days to come shall all be forgotten. And how dieth the wise man? as the fool. Therefore I hated life; because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me: for all is vanity and vexation of spirit."* (Ecclesiastes I, 14-18; II, 1-17.)

Thus in his own person Solomon describes all mankind in the account he gives of his search for pleasure of all kinds, from the grossest to the most elevated,—the elemental pleasures to be had from food and drink,

as well as the pure delights that come from the search for wisdom and the practice of the Fine Arts. And from his own experience he shows that this pursuit does not always exalt the soul, but on the contrary sometimes regrades instead of refreshing it,—nay, may even kill it by engendering a hate not merely towards every vanity of life but also towards life itself. How could the Word of God encourage in us the pursuit of vanities so destructive to self?

Why cannot the people of our time see that their Solomons lack the wisdom of that Solomon of old whom God enlightened? That solely because they have the capacity to experience pleasure, they have taken delight in all the charms of the natural world, in all the variety of artificial joys a sterile world could offer them, until at last they have lost the very desire for pleasure along with the power to experience it further? That the Christian Religion has the effect of lifting up the heart of man to pleasures that are spiritual, lofty, and wholly pure; of lifting it up to a vision of beauty which is endless, and which is ordered by the music of a heavenly harmony; of lifting it up to joys which engender a thirst unquenchable, elevated endlessly and forever according to the very measure of infinity itself?

The great goal of that sublime endeavor of the soul of man is shown by Christ our Saviour to be the acquiring of such cleanness of heart as to be able to contemplate God Himself, Who is Supreme and Perfect Beauty:—*"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."*

The contribution of the Christian Religion to the elevation, the refinement, the purification, the joy, and the untroubling satisfaction of human sense, as well as to the perfection of the Arts, is as evident as in its magnitude it is beyond all estimating. We are not speaking of the Saints of God, who during their life on earth gave themselves completely to the love of God and to the contemplation of heavenly Beauty, as, for example, did the Psalmist who sings: *"Whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever. (Psalm LXXX, 25-26). O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing and give praise, even with my glory. Awake, psaltery and harp: I myself will awake early. I will praise thee, O Lord."* (Psalm CVIII, 1-3). Or as did the Apostle Paul, who cries out in an ecstasy that stirs the very depths of our hearts: *"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."* (Romans VIII, 35-39.)

No! We speak not only of the Saints of God; for not only into them, but likewise into the whole world the Christian Religion has instilled a rightful love of life and of the joys of life as the highest gift of God; instilled a love of nature and of the beauties of nature as the most fair handiwork of God; begot in us a love of sacred history as our own soul's possession, as well as a love of the history of our country, the cradle both of our physical and of our spiritual beings. The Christian Religion

brought the gift of peaceful poetry to all parts of society, as well to the meanest hut as to the finest palaces. The Christian Religion inspired a most sublime and most pure poetry,—the sacred compositions of the Church's worship and literature, those of the East as well as those of the West, infinite in variety. The Christian Religion produced original and enduring schools of architecture, the Byzantine and the Gothic styles. The same Christian Religion brought into existence also the schools of Church painting,—the Byzantine of the East, the Italian of the West, and others,—which lifted the art of painting to a height never before attained, nor ever to be surpassed hereafter, since to higher excellence than that of Raphael art cannot rise. The Christian Religion also originated music: in the East the pure Church song which ranges from the simple and affecting melodies known to every plain man, to the wondrously beautiful music for the days of the Great Week and for Easter composed by such devout masters as Fourchaninoff and Bortniansky; and in the West the majestic, heaven-exalted instrumental music which ranges from the melodies of ancient Christian simplicity to the most moving and affecting compositions of Mozart and others.

Like a mighty river Christian Art has flowed peacefully and smoothly through two thousand years, imbuing all of Christian mankind with ingenuous love for its Creator and for the life of both earth and heaven, a mighty flood which until two centuries ago beat against no rock of doubt or agnosticism, of little faith or negation. From the first mighty clash in which those two greatest powers of the spirit met in conflict,—the pure angelic power of Faith and the satanic power of Unbelief,—at the first stroke of the conflict of those opposites there came into existence the mightiest creations of poetic genius; but thereafter,—I beg you to see and to consider for yourselves,—did not the power of art decline? Did it not become enfeebled? Did not the whole spirit of mankind begin to die along with the progressive enfeebling and decay of Faith in men's hearts? And is it not true that at the same time creative art began to die also? The art of painting long ago reached its height, and has fallen into decay with the decrease of hearty attachment to the inspired teachings of Christ's Gospel. Did not a noted Russian writer in exile make clear to the most illustrious of modern Russian painters that, because that artist had lost his Christian ideals, the sense of reverence for sacred subjects with which he had begun his paintings of them had been killed by the eccentric details of his anatomical technique? As for those who carried Art ahead in the same direction, is not the world already amazed at their open mockery of the subjects which mankind has revered for two thousand years, and which hundreds of millions reverence still? Because of its cooling toward ideals that root their life in eternity, however dim they may become in our hearts, has not painting sought new ideals for itself, without finding them anywhere?

And as for the music of our day, though it has developed its technique endlessly, has it not degenerated amid the cracklings and groanings which foretell the utter destruction of musical harmony and melody?

I beg you to consider: Have authors, the tellers of tales, not disappeared, both ours and those of Western Europe? Alas for the writers

who, though ancient, are yet of our own time, the writers who delighted us with their works from our childhood to the time of our old age! They have died out, not only among us, but also in Europe; and successors to them have not yet been born, either among us or in Europe. When with lamentation and heartfelt grief we laid Dostoevsky and Turgenief in the tomb, were we not in attendance at another and incomparably more afflicting funeral,—if not the funeral of all Russian creative consciousness, certainly the funeral, in at least some sense, of an accepted type of artistic endeavor which through the course of centuries had ruled man's imagination? The living Christian spirit, and the ideals which for centuries had been dearest to men's hearts, died out. Art in all its variety of expression communicated its inspiration by collaborating with the distinctive and life-giving Christian ideal; and with the passing of the ideal, Art perished, in spite of the elaboration of its technique to the utmost of human skill,—architecture, painting, music, poetry. Never before had the perfection of technical detail been carried so far; but the masters themselves came to see that a spirit was gone out of it. In an earlier day, some poor chapel in a wood where before a crudely wrought crucifix some beggar sang "My Jesus most loved," or where an old rustic First-Chanter sang the simple yet unpretentiously lovely song "Christ is risen from the dead," all sweetly uttered to believing hearts, had for a man of simple piety and deep faith an infinitely greater eloquence than have galleries of paintings and concerts of music for icy hearts and coldly skeptical minds.

Nevertheless, the sound and simple understanding that engenders love is like a phoenix which though consumed by fire yet lives anew in those creations of Art which by their own Spirit nourish the soul of man. Alas! The forms of art, brought almost to perfection, remain, but the Spirit is flying because the faith in the Spirit is passing away. In the place of the Spirit Divine, Infinite, Eternally Loving, the prevailing sentiment of our day puts nothingness; the ideal of mankind is become nothingness; and the only fruit of that ideal is nothingness. Without the eternal, loving ideal of the Infinite there can be no Art, because true Art always has been and of necessity must always be a life-begetting service to the life-giving ideal of the Infinite.

Brethren, let us pray for the continuation of our spiritual life. Death has not yet conquered. The powerful life of Christian mankind is a mighty tree, which life-sucking parasites hem in close about; it is a beautiful fruit, into which an alien worm has crept. Millions of souls still nourish everything that is to be grasped by faith, including their faith in the ideal. Let us remember that faith in God, in the infinity of eternal beauty, in immortality, has brought into existence all that we know to be most lofty both in man's impulses and in his Art. Let us pray that that life-giving spirit of faith may not perish in us; and that the Heavenly Spirit which cleanses our hearts from every stain and makes them able to contemplate the divine Beauty, may rest upon this School of Art, and may fill all who work here, teachers and pupils, with the Pure Spirit of His Wisdom and of His life-begetting Activity. Amen.

The Life and Work of the Most Reverend Metropolitan Innocent

ARCHBISHOP of

Kamchatka, the Kuriles and the Aleutian Islands,
And Later, Metropolitan of Moscow

Reprinted in honor of his hundred and thirtieth anniversary from a translation printed for distribution among the people by request of the Most Reverend Bishop Nicholas of the North American Diocese in 1897, on the hundredth anniversary of the birth of the Metropolitan Innocent.

I.

INNOCENTIUS, Archbishop of Kamchatka, the Kuriles and the Aleutian Islands, the ever memorable preacher of Christianity in the extreme East, was elevated to the vacant See of Moscow in 1867, on the demise of the celebrated Metropolitan Philaret. From the distant shores of the Amoor he went direct to the first capital city of Moscow—the heart of Russia.

The town of Anginskoe in the Government of Irkoutsk was the home of Innocentius. The register of the church in Anginskoe shows that “on the 26th of August (old style), 1797, the wife of the sacristan of the church of St. Elias the Prophet, Eusebius Popov, bore him a son who was named John.” At five years of age John Popov commenced to study his alphabet, being instructed by his father, who was at the time already afflicted with the disease which brought on his death two years later, leaving a widow and four orphans in extreme poverty. Fortunately the uncle of the orphans, a deacon of the same church, Demetrius Popov, in order to help the orphaned family somewhat, took the little boy John into his own home and continued teaching him. The little one learned so rapidly that in his eighth year he read the epistles in church and by his clear reading afforded much consolation to the parishioners. The mother of the boy, observing her son’s success, desired to obtain his father’s vacancy for him, in order to support the family; but this did not come to pass. At nine years of age John Popov was brought to Irkoutsk, where he was received as a scholar at the theological seminary.

At the seminary John surpassed all his schoolmates in learning. Tall of stature, with a good figure, and healthy, he was readily distinguished in their midst. At the time when John Popov entered the seminary, his uncle, with whom he previously lived, became a widower, and having taken the monastic vows with the name of David, he was transferred to Irkoutsk, making his home at the episcopal house, having also been ordained to the priesthood; and here, as before, he continued to care for his nephew, who often visited him. Father David was fond of mechanical labor; his nephew, coming to him, often found him at work on some machinery, and, looking on, assisted him, thus becoming very fond of the mechanical art himself.

At the seminary, during the time free of lessons, John always found occupation for himself; he would go somewhere apart from his school-mates and read to himself, or else engage in building something. It was in this way he made in one of the rooms of the seminary a water-clock. The frame and wheels were made with a common knife and awl, the face was made of writing paper, the pointers of bits of wood. The water was poured into a pot of birch bark, and the dripping of it on a piece of tin beneath the pot sounded like the ticking of an ordinary clock; a bell sounded the hours. John's fellow-pupils were very much amused by this.

In 1814 a new rector of the seminary, guided by certain motives, thought it proper to change the surnames of the pupils. In giving names, the authorities generally considered some characteristic of the pupil, which assisted in making up the name; for instance, one who was good-looking consequently received the name Blagovidov (i. e., Good-looks); a pupil of quiet disposition was named Tihomirov (tihi is quiet, and mir is the world; the final *ov* or *off* denotes the possessive case and generally can be translated as *son*, for instance Johnson). Veniaminov was the name given to John Popov. He was named thus in honor of Benjamin, the Bishop of Irkoutsk, who was much loved by all, and who had died that same year. In 1817 John Veniaminov married, after which he was ordained a deacon for the Church of the Annunciation in Irkoutsk.

Graduating from the seminary John Veniaminov was appointed teacher of a parish school, and after a year ordained a priest for the same Church of the Annunciation. In the course of his service (which was short, a little over two years) he won the esteem and love of his people as a good shepherd who cares for his flock. The inhabitants of Irkoutsk long remembered the even and grand church services of Father John, likewise his kindly nature and pastoral cares. On Sundays, before the liturgy, he would gather the children in the church and instruct them in Christian lessons. Only two years passed thus, in which he enjoyed his quiet home life; soon he must change it for a life full of privations, trouble, heavy labor and glorious undertakings.

In 1823 the Most Holy Synod requested the Bishop of Irkoutsk to send a priest to the Island Ounalashka, for the purpose of enlightening the natives with the faith of Christ. Ounalashka and the neighboring islands lie out a long distance from Siberia, between Kamchatka and America. The Prelate informed the clergy of Irkoutsk, but no one was found to accept the Holy Synod's offer. No one desired to go to a strange and distant land. The Bishop was put in an awkward position; the order of the Synod must be carried out, yet no volunteers were found, and he could not send any one against his will. Then it was that the priest of the Annunciation (parish), Father John Veniaminov came to His Right Reverence and informed him of his willingness to go to Ounalashka. The Bishop was not a little surprised at this; he was sorry to give up an exemplary clergyman.

It must be remembered that at the time this announcement was sent to the clergy by the Bishop, Father Veniaminov, as well as all the clergy, did not so much as think of accepting it. It happened that Father John about this same time became acquainted with a certain John Kriukov,

who had come to Irkoutsk from Ounalashka. This newcomer, Kriukov, from the coast of America, had much to tell him of Ounalashka and of life out there and he went so far as to persuade him to accept the Bishop's offer. But no persuasion affected him. How it was that Father John became taken with the desire to go to such a distant land, many years after he tells of it himself in these words. "When that pioneer, John Kriukov, had already bidden me good-bye, and on his farewell-taking still continued to persuade me to go to Ounalashka—and on the same day, taking leave of the Bishop (in whose presence I happened to be then) he commenced telling of the devotion of the Aleuts to prayer and to listening to the Word of God (may the name of the Lord be blessed); I suddenly, it can be said, and completely became inflamed with the desire to go to such a people. I now vividly call to memory; how I suffered with impatience, waiting for the moment when I could inform His Right Reverence of my intention, and how he seemed to be surprised, saying only: "We shall see."

After a long hesitation the Bishop at last consented. The family of Father John did not so much as suspect the rapid change in his determination. On coming home Father John said nothing of his intentions to his family. But, of course, such a sudden turn in his fate could not but reflect itself on him, so that it became apparent to those around him. During one of the family conversations, his little son, somewhat over a year old, came up to him. Father John took him up in his arms. "My child," said he, "where will your feet soon be a-walking." Now only was it that his family surmised at what had happened; they fell upon him with tears and wailings, begging him to alter his decision. But he remained steadfast. They commenced to prepare for the long, strange journey.

On the 7th of May, 1823, Father John left Irkoutsk with his family, which then consisted of his old mother, his wife, a son a year old, and a brother.

First of all he went to his home, in rural Anginskoe, and from there, having offered a prayer-service, took a barge going down the river Lena to Yakoutsk. (The Lena is the largest river in Siberia and flows into the Arctic Ocean.)

From Yakoutsk Father John had to ride to Ohotsk, a city in Eastern Siberia, on the shore of the Sea of Ohotsk. The distance between Yakoutsk and Ohotsk is one thousand versts, or about 700 miles, and he made all that way with his family, on horseback. The road was a difficult one; now he would ride by narrow trails through dense forests, then he would make his way over such marshy land that a horse would sink into it to its belly, and at other times he must climb along a slope, or a steep, rocky mountain and move along its slippery back covered with snow. Yet with God's help Father John patiently overcame all these hardships. At last the travelers heard the dull roar of sea waves breaking against the high cliffs on the coast. The masts of vessels on the Ohotsk River gradually appeared to them, and then the city of Ohotsk itself. From Ohotsk to the Island of Ounalashka, Father John made the voyage in a sailing vessel. On the 29th of July, 1824, he safely arrived at the place of his appointment.

II.

Ounalashka is one of the Aleutian Islands. These Islands lie in the Pacific Ocean between Kamchatka and Alaska. Ounalashka is about the largest island in the Aleutian group. It is 150 versts in length and more than fifty in width (somewhat over a hundred miles long by thirty-five wide).

The climate on this Island, as well as on the others, is damp and changeable. Cloudy weather with fogs and winds is the condition for the most part of the year, while clear and bright days are very rare, not more than fifty of them throughout the year. The summer here is not too warm, but in winter the frosts are sometimes so severe as to frost-bite a flying bird.

Besides the Aleutian Islands there were others also which belonged to the parish of Father John; among them were the Fox, the Pribilov and other Islands.

The native inhabitants of all these islands are employed in hunting fur-animals and fishing. They live in villages of earthen huts,¹ which appear more like bear haunts than human habitations. In the day time the interior of the hut obtains its light from a window in the roof, through which also the smoke escapes, but at night a fire burns in the center of the hut, which heats it also.

The wealthy Aleuts have the walls of their huts covered with furs and skins; no furniture or seats provided, they sit upon the floor. Their utensils they seldom wash, although they cook and wash their clothes in the same. The Aleuts are an unclean people.

In appearance the Aleuts are homely and have poor features; they are of middle stature, but on first sight they appear to be very short, because of the fact that the knees of all of them are bent in consequence of their continual posture on the floor, or sitting in a baidarka (canoe). They walk with the points of their feet turning in, while their heels spread outwards. It is impossible for a Russian to walk in the path made by an Aleut.

These people are good and soft-hearted. In time of want; and during the winters, a famine is nothing new with them; should any one of them be able to obtain some food, he will be sure to divide it among them all. They show much attention and love for their parents and elders. They are very hardy and patient. It seems impossible to think of any hardship that an Aleut could not bear, or of any sorrow that would make him melancholy. In time of want it is nothing extraordinary for him to live on water alone for three or four days. In sickness, when suffering excruciating pain, you will not hear him utter a cry nor a sigh.

Up to the time of the arrival of Father John, the Aleuts were in a wild condition, and in religious belief they were half idol worshippers. Father John had found but one chapel in Ounalashka on his arrival there, and that was an old wooden one. His first work was to build a new church. Being himself a good carpenter and builder, he began teaching the natives these handicrafts, and as soon as they were sufficiently proficient, he commenced building the church. At that he took a lively personal interest in the work, and made with his own hands the holy table and ikonostasis,² which he gilded. The church was dedicated in honor of the

¹This was before the Russians had fully succeeded in obtaining the necessary materials for building, which are not provided by nature in the Alaskan Islands.

²A screen with the images of our Lord, the Apostles, etc., separating the altar from the body of the temple.

Ascension of the Lord. At the same time Father Veniaminov undertook a great and difficult task—the study of the native languages. He desired to translate for the aborigines the Gospel and the liturgy, and—as we shall see hereafter—he accomplished the undertaking. We call this work remarkable, for the reason that he had to undergo the labor of inventing the very alphabet itself, which these languages never had. Studying the Aleutian language, Father John endeavored to acquaint himself with their traditions and customs, in order to be better understood when preaching to them the Word of God. He could often be seen conversing with those who were converted before he came to the island, and also with the pagan natives, about the true religion.

He preached sermons to them adapted to their understanding; he explained the meaning of the different feasts, confession and holy communion, also repeating how necessary it is to often attend church services.

Eye-witnesses recall to memory the sermon that Father John preached on the Sunday of Cheese-Fare, on February 9th, 1828, which also happened to be the day of St. Innocentius, the Wonder-worker of Irkoutsk. The great multitude of hearers were impressed and moved to tears by the sincere words and humility of this priest. First he explained the meaning of fast and showed the difference between the primitive Christians and those of today. "The Christians of old," said Father John Veniaminov, "with great joy looked forward and awaited the coming of holy Lent, as they knew the power and benefit of Lent, and they understood wherefore it was instituted—and they knew not only with their mind, or by hearing, but by the very sense of feeling (experience). But many of the Christians of today, with sorrow see the approach of the time of fast, because they do not see, and do not know, or do not care to know and see the power and benefit of Lent." Then the preacher put the question: "Why was it that Lent was instituted, and how can we fulfill the duties which it exacts of us?" Explaining this question, he then continued: "Our Orthodox Church (Græco-Russian) follows the custom of asking forgiveness on this day for the offenses done one to another, as the time of Great Lent is come, during which we must beg forgiveness of the Heavenly Father. In fulfilling this holy practice, I, your unworthy pastor, ask of you, my brethren, the forgiveness of all with which I have sinned before you, if by word, or in deed, or in my life; may God by His grace forgive and have mercy upon us all. I advise you also, brethren, to fulfill this duty now, and to always keep the practice hereafter. We should forgive and ask forgiveness sincerely and correctly, and not in outward appearance, falsely. Moreover, the holy Church—our Mother, advises and requests us—and the duty of Christianity demands of us—to keep this holy Lent, to cleanse our conscience from (the stain of) evil works by true repentance. And in this way, with a pure soul and heart, we shall go forward to meet the great day of the glorious Resurrection."

It was not only with the sermons which he preached near his home that Father John served his charge. His parish was widely scattered, over several thousand versts; he had to sail from island to island, from one village to another. To these voyages Father Veniaminov gave a good part of the year. His patience and intrepidity while traveling are truly worthy of admiration. He suffered privations and risked danger sailing from island to island, over the ocean waves in a little boat (baidarka—an Aleutian canoe made of skin), so narrow, that he must outstretch his limbs and keep them so, as if they were bound together in swaddling clothes. Sometimes Father John was obliged to suffer hunger and cold,

and again, being caught in a sweeping rain, wet to the bone, he would have to lodge in a dirty and cold earthen hut. Arriving at a village of Aleuts, if it was convenient, Father John performed the Church services, or simply gathered together the inhabitants and taught them the Word of God and advised them to receive baptism. But he never administered to them the Sacrament of Baptism, until they had asked for it themselves.

Having acquired the Aleutian language, Father John invented an alphabet for it and little by little commenced to translate for his people the sacred books. This way he translated into the Aleutian language the catechism and the Gospel of St. Matthew. In order to teach the Aleuts how to read and write, he opened a school on the Island of Ounalashka for boys and taught them himself.

Father Veniaminov loved the Aleuts for their simple-heartedness and diligence in hearing the Word of God; and the Aleuts also loved their pastor, and were sincerely devoted to him for his good nature and for the kindness he showed them. "Of all the good qualities of the Aleuts," Father John would say, "nothing gave me more pleasure and satisfied my heart more than the diligence they had for listening, or rather the thirst they had for hearing the Word of God, for a most untiring preacher could become weary sooner than their diligence become lessened. Let us explain this by an example. On my arrival in a village, one and all, leaving their work and occupations at my first call, at once gathered to hear me preach, and listening with wonderful attention, not allowing themselves to become restless or even to turn their eyes from me. The most tender mothers seemed at such moments to grow hardened at the cry of their children, of whom only those were brought along that were able to understand. I acknowledge openly that during such conversations (or preaching), I experienced in fact the consolations of the Christian faith, those sweet and unspeakable touches of grace, and therefore I owe the Aleuts more thanks than they owe me for my work, and I will never forget them."

On the Island of Ounalashka Father John at first lived with his family in an earthen hut, then in a small wooden house, which he built with his own hands. The furniture, the clock on the wall, were his own make; in a word, when it was necessary, he became carpenter, mechanic, watch-maker, and sometimes a maker of fishing nets. The evenings Father Veniaminov sometimes would spend in mechanical work, or in teaching his own children, to whom he was most kind. Not only his own children, but other children as well, he loved, and he could often be seen surrounded by them, explaining to them some lessons from Sacred History or the Gospel in his simple way, and with language easily understood, or at other times playing at ball with them. He would ramble with the children in the hills, and, as a lover and observer of nature, he would share with them his knowledge. Besides such occupations, Father John with his children would make the candles for their church.

In such constant labor and cares, Father John Veniaminov passed ten years on the Island of Ounalashka. During that time he converted to Christianity all the inhabitants of the island. The toil and noble undertakings of this good priest could not remain unnoticed on the part of the authorities, and he was rewarded with a pectoral cross. Then he was transferred to the Port of New Archangel, or Sitkha (on Baranov Island), that he might convert another people—the Koloshas.

III.

Sitkha or New Archangel is a good distance from the Aleutian Islands, and lies almost within touch of the mainland of America.

The climate here is noted for being damp, and during most part of the year the weather is gloomy and foggy. The soil on this island (now known as Baranov—the name of one of the Governors) is marshland and partly stone, covered with a thin layer of putrefied matter. Novoarchangelsk is situated on the western coast of the island, and at that time it was the central headquarters for the government of the Russian Colonies in America. Novoarchangelsk (New Archangel) or Sitkha is surrounded by mountains, which are covered with forests of tall trees of the fir species. It should be mentioned that the woods of this Sitkha (the Indian name) or Baranov Island are of a wonderful growth, some of the trunks of spruce measuring 150 feet in length.

The inhabitants of this Island—the Kolosha (or Thlinket tribe of Alaskan Indians)—among whom the Reverend Father Veniaminov had now to labor, differed from the Aleuts in appearance as well as in character. In appearance they are handsome: they have large black eyes, correct face, black hair, and are of medium stature. The Kolosha has a proud and selfish nature. On visiting the Russians they would don their best apparel and maintain a haughty bearing. They are very revengeful; if a Kolosha for some reason could not avenge himself during his life for some offense, he would transmit his revenge to his generation. The Kolosha possess a lively mind and they are sagacious.

They were less acquainted with the Christian religion than the Aleuts. Toward the Russians, especially before this time, they were hostile, and such a bearing greatly impeded the spread of Christianity among them. After his arrival in Sitkha, Father John commenced work in the same way he had done on the Island of Ounalashka, i. e., he began by learning the language and customs of the Koloshas, and then proceeded to preach the Word of God to them. At the same time, as was his wont, he gave freely of his labor, his strength, his health. As in Ounalashka, now also he often preached to his congregation in the church, and when possible visited them in their homes, and there in the family—as a father among his children—he told them of the Orthodox religion. The Kolosha learned to love their teacher, and commenced to receive him with a welcome, willingly and attentively listening to his lessons.

Living among the Koloshas, Father John wrote sermons for them in their native tongue and translated the sacred books, which helped much in spreading Orthodoxy among them. The labor of the Reverend John Veniaminov was not lost; the result was that the number of Christians in that country increased very rapidly.

For five years Father John worked on Baranov Island (Sitkha). His fifteen years of active missionary life (first in Ounalashka, then in Sitkha) was distinguished with the zeal that made famous the first teachers of the Gospel. He always went about his work with great care, and thereby drew to himself the rough hearts of the savages; he would convince, but not urge, then patiently wait for their own petition asking for baptism. For the children Father John opened schools, and taught them from books he had himself compiled. Finally, besides enlightening the natives with the knowledge of the Gospel, he taught them the different trades of smith-craft and carpentry, and also introduced inoculation (to prevent epidemics among them). In this way he won their hearty sym-

pathy; the Indians loved him. And he really was their benefactor and teacher.

Many years of experience in missionary work convinced our preacher that it was difficult to keep the spirit of Christianity animated in a country, already containing a large number of the baptized, and in which the native villages are so scattered. For this, continual exhortation was necessary, and yet it was impossible through the lack of priests and insufficiency of means. In order to remove these hindrances, and this could be done by the authority of the Church Government, it was necessary to take steps and intercede. And so Father John decided to go to St. Petersburg for this purpose. Besides this he must apply personally for permission to print his Aleutian translations of the sacred books. Having thus decided, Father John took a leave of absence, and—sending his wife and children to their home in Irkoutsk—on the 8th of November, 1838, he left Sitkha, taking sail in a globe circumnavigating vessel. His voyage continued for eight months. On the 25th of June, 1839, Father John arrived in St. Petersburg and presented his petition for the decision of the Most Holy Synod. Learning that it would take some months before the question of his petition would be taken up, he occupied himself in collecting offerings for the purpose of propagating and confirming the Christian religion in the Aleutian Islands, and for this he went also to Moscow.

In Moscow he presented himself to the Most Reverend Philaret, the Metropolitan—Archbishop. At first sight the Prelate took a liking for the hardworking, industrious missionary. "There is something apostle-like in this man"—he would say when speaking of Father John. More than once, when time permitted, they conversed together alone and the Prelate would listen with interest to the wonderful stories Father John told of his life in the Aleutian Islands. In the fall our traveler returned to St. Petersburg and he was promoted to the office of Archpriest for his long apostolic labors.

But at this time he received the sad news, informing him of the death of his wife. This sorrow weighed heavily upon him. The Metropolitan Philaret, consoling him, advised him to take vows and enter the monastic state. This proposal compelled the Father Archpriest to stop and deeply consider. He could not make up his mind, because his six children—two sons and four daughters—seemed to hold him in check; he had no one to entrust them to and no where to settle them. Not consenting to the proposition of Metropolitan Philaret he went to Kiev in order to pray there and pay his reverence to those miraculous shrines. On his return from Kiev he was summoned before the Most Holy Synod, and when here advised to take the vows of a monk, he consented, giving himself up to the will of God. His children, at Philaret's request, were settled in the best possible manner.

On the 29th of November, 1840, the Archpriest John Veniaminov, entering the monastic order, was tonsured and given the name of Innocent; at the same time he was ordered as an Archimandrite (an abbot with the privilege of wearing a mitre). In the meantime the Holy Synod had concluded to organize a new diocese in Alaska. The question arose as to who should be the bishop of the new diocese. The names of three selected candidates were presented to the Emperor Nicholas Pavlovich, one of which was that of the Archimandrite Innocentius. The Sovereign desired to see him. Having received the newly appointed Archimandrite kindly, the Emperor, bidding him adieu, said to him:

"Tell the Metropolitan it is my desire that you be appointed bishop for the new diocese."

The consecration of the Right Reverend Innocent in the episcopal order took place on the 15th of December, 1840, in St. Petersburg, in the grand church of our Lady of Kazan. "I firmly hope and believe," said Innocentius at the time of his installation as a newly-elect Bishop, "that the Lord, who has guided me so long and now is giving me this new lot of service, will by His grace give me also new and greater strength for the accomplishment of the same. I pray you, the God-selected fathers and guardians of the Church upon earth, to give me a place in your prayers, praying to the Lord, in my behalf, that His grace and mercy be with me evermore." The 10th of January, 1841, was the day on which Bishop Innocent left St. Petersburg to go to his church in Alaska.

On his way back he visited Irkoutsk. One can imagine with what feeling the Right Reverend Innocent entered his native city, and with what joy and veneration the population of Irkoutsk must have received one of their former pastors—John Veniaminov, who now was an Archbishop. The people met him in crowds on entering the city; the bells on every church chimed. The Bishop visited the Church of the Annunciation, where he formerly served as a priest, and offered the Liturgy and a thanksgiving service. Having left Irkoutsk he stopped on his way in his native Anginskoe, went into the cottage in which he was born and where his childhood was spent, visited his old acquaintances, and—having offered a service of supplications—commenced his long journey, cheered with the well wishes of his countrymen. At last, on the 27th of September, 1841, after a long and tiresome voyage, Innocentius safely reached Sitkha, or the port of New Archangel.

IV.

Now after taking upon himself a new vocation, Bishop Innocent's work of spreading Christianity and enlightenment had greatly increased. He commenced by opening new parishes, the necessity of which by this time was strongly felt. Ordaining priests for the new parishes, the Right Rev. Innocent gave them the most minute instructions how to act, and requested them to convince by the power of the Word, but not with force or bribes.

Only seven months after his arrival in Novoarchangelsk (Baranov Island), Bishop Innocent again set sail for the purpose of voyaging through the diocese and inspecting it. He left the town of Sitkha on the 4th of May, 1842.

On every island, in each village, wherever the Bishop came, he was received with the greatest triumph and joy by the inhabitants; and in no place did he leave them without his episcopal instruction. On the 18th of August, 1842, he landed in the Port of Petropavlosk, Kamchatka.

Petropavlovsk is a small town surrounded by mountains and situated on their slope by the water—on the Bay of Avachin. The houses here are built in the same fashion that we find them in all eastern Siberia. The haven, broad and convenient for vessels, is known to navigators as one of the largest in the world. In Petropavlovsk Bishop Innocent

remained for four months, awaiting the wintry season for journeying. Finally on the 29th of November the great journey of Innocentius through Kamchatka commenced. The Archpriest Gromov, who was one of the travelers, going over the snow in dog sleighs, describes the journey in these words: "There are three kinds of conveyances which are used in journeys over the snow, and which are drawn by dogs. The first is the *sanka*—this is nothing else than a saddle made of twigs and rods fixed on thin slides. The second is a *narta*—very much like a child's sled, only much larger, and then the *povozochka*, also a *narta* with the addition of a box it has fixed upon it which is made of deer skin or canvas. Some of the better *povozochki* contain a window in the covering made of glass or mica, so that during long voyages one may read and not feel so much the irksomeness. On the *sanka* only one person can sit, and it is used for light drives. The *narta* is used for transferring heavy weights, and the *povozochka* for the carrying of important personages and the higher officials. In this last conveyance only one person can sit, and at that in such a position that he cannot move or turn. On the front the *Kayour* (driver) sits supplied with a pole, which serves in his hands as a balance over uneven roads, and as a brake on going down hill. For the *sanka* five dogs are sufficient, but for the *narta* and *povozochka* from fourteen to twenty dogs must be harnessed. They are tied in pairs to a long strap which is attached to the sleigh, and this sort of a coach flits along like an arrow over the snow-drifts. The dogs are controlled by the voice of the *kayour*, *gkah*, *gkah* (to the right), *gkuh*, *gkuh* (to the left), *hna* (stop), but for trained dogs it is sufficient, without using the voice, to strike with the pole on one or the other side of the sleigh and they will turn to the right or left accordingly."

By means of these dog-sleds the Right Reverend Innocent had traveled over 5,000 versts. "One cannot imagine"—say those who traveled in Kamchatka—"all the hardships of the traveler who is drawn only by dogs for several hundred miles over a snowy plain, when the thermometer falls to twenty below zero in a Siberian frost. For the safety of travelers in a snowstorm, which sometimes lasts for several days in succession, log huts at every forty or fifty versts are built, and in these they pass the night. In these huts, which are not made well, a stone fireplace can be found. But it often happens that travelers cannot reach such a shelter before night; they then dig into the snow till they reach the ground, which makes a kind of cave, at the entrance of which they light a fire, and in this way, in a most severe frost, they are compelled to pass the night."

On the 3rd of April, 1843, Bishop Innocent arrived in Ohotsk, where he remained for about four months; at that time he was spreading the Faith among the Koriak, Chukcha and the Tunguz.

At last the first journey of Bishop Innocent was finished, and he safely arrived in Novoarchangelsk, where he occupied himself in bringing to order his young diocese. But this was not his last tour of inspection; he had made three such voyages and journeys, during which he carefully examined the newly organized parishes, consecrated churches, personally preached the word of God to the natives and—where it was possible—

opened schools for the children. For his good work, in 1850, Innocentius was raised to the dignity of an Archbishop.³

The success in spreading Christianity on the distant borders of Asia and America by the Most Reverend Innocent was the reason why the higher government of the church added to his diocese the country of the Yakout, with the inhabitants of which he earlier became acquainted. On this account Archbishop Innocent had to change the place of his residence from Novoarchangelsk, or Sitkha, to the city of Rakoutsk in Siberia.

Living in Yakoutsk, the Prelate took much pains in supervising the translation of the sacred books into the Yakout language. Great was the days for the Yakout people when at last the first Liturgy was offered in their native language.

The Archbishop himself officiated at the praise service and read the Gospel. This event had so touched the hearts of the Yakouts that their native representatives came to the Prelate Innocent with their petition, asking that this day forever be kept as a holiday, because it was the first on which they heard in the temple the Divine teaching in their own tongue.

From Yakoutsk the Archbishop, not considering his old age, often undertook journeys over his great diocese which now had become much more widened, exposing himself to privations and dangers. During one of these journeys, when in the port of Ayan, he was nearly captured by the English, who suddenly took possession of that town, they being then at war with Russia.

At the end of June, 1857, the Most Reverend Innocent was summoned to St. Petersburg for the purpose of taking part in the councils of the Most Holy Synod. During his sojourn in the Capital an Imperial High Degree had been issued, granting two Vicars (assistant Bishops to an Archbishop), one for Yakoutsk and the other for Sitkha. In this way the labors of the Venerable Archbishop were made lighter.³

The Most Reverend Innocent left St. Petersburg in the beginning of 1858, but before going to Yakoutsk he traveled through the Amoor Country, which was then annexed to Russia. The great Amoor River flows for several thousand versts and separates the Chinese boundary line from the Russian. During this journey, the Archbishop stopped in almost every town by the River and held services. But what was still more simple, he would sometimes on passing a village give orders to land, and then he would commence to teach the inhabitants who had run together on the beach. And nothing on these occasions was hid from the Prelate; he entered into all the cares and needs of his people, both the spiritual and the bodily.

In 1862 the Most Reverend Innocent took up his home in the town of

³ It is worthy of especial note that the first active Prelate of the North American Diocese was made Archbishop and that seventy years ago Vicar Bishops were assigned to the North American Province of the Orthodox Church by the Russian Holy Synod. For the succeeding fifty years, until 1907, the Archbishops and Vicar Bishops appointed by the Holy Synod of Russia exercised sole and complete, unquestioned and unchallenged jurisdiction and authority over all Orthodox Christians of whatever origin or nationality in the New World. Not until twenty years ago, after a Russian jurisdiction over America had been in authority for a hundred and ten years, did any other Orthodox National Church or Patriarchate raise the question of establishing any separate mission or jurisdiction in America.—*Editor*.

Blagoveshchensk on the banks of the Amoor. Here also he continued untiringly to fulfill the duties of his office, endeavoring much to firmly plant Orthodoxy in the diocese. From this place he likewise often undertook journeys along the Amoor and into other districts, personally inspecting and instructing the newly converted. But old age and poor health already compelled him to think of rest. He asked to be relieved and to be given quarters for rest. But his pastoral cares were not to be ended this time, and the will of God prepared for him another duty.

In 1867 Philaret, the Metropolitan of Moscow, had passed into eternity, and for a long time it could not be decided as to who should be appointed successor to the great Prelate. At last the election was held; the Archbishop Innocent was appointed to succeed the deceased Metropolitan. The Most Reverend Innocent was shocked with greater surprise than any one else. Having read the dispatch, he changed in the face, and for some minutes fell into deep thought. He then secluded himself for that day, and during the night he prayed long and fervently upon his knees. He was taken with wonder over his own destiny; the son of a poor village sexton, who at one time was unable to become the sacristan in place of his father, comes to be one of the first hierarchs in the great Russian Church—a Metropolitan in Moscow!

In sincere humility, notwithstanding his poor health, Archbishop Innocent accepted his new appointment and began to prepare for the way.

It would be needless to say with what expressions of joy and veneration the inhabitants of the cities of Siberia had met and seen him off on the way through which he must pass. It was the first time in their life they had seen a Metropolitan, and the last, as the Prelates who are invested with such high dignity, do not visit these distant places. With especial triumph he was waited upon in his own native Irkoutsk, where, owing to washouts, he had to remain for a considerable time, during which he offered the Liturgy several times, together with other Bishops who were there. Finally at 9:30 o'clock, on the evening of the 25th of May, 1868, the ringing bells heard all over Moscow announced that the new Archpastor had arrived in the capital. On the next day the Most Reverend Innocentius, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, officially entered the great Church of the Assumption. On entering the Cathedral the Prelate delivered an address which was full of true humility.

"Who am I"—he said—"to dare to take the word and the power of my predecessors? A pupil of distant times, of a remote country, who passed more than half a lifetime on the frontiers; one who is only a common worker in Christ's vineyard, a teacher of children and of those who are new in the Faith."

With such humility did the Metropolitan Innocent enter into his new office. He was now more than seventy years of age, worn with sickness, nearly blind, yet he was full of strength and zeal for activity. Administering the government of his new diocese, by his care he did much that was beneficial. He erected asylums for widows and orphans, organized different benevolent societies, sought to alleviate the condition of the poor clergy, took measures for the better education of the populace, and

besides all this, sat in the Council of the Holy Synod, taking part in ministering the spiritual affairs of all Russia. On the 18th of May, 1871, exactly fifty years had passed from the day on which John Veniaminov was ordained a priest, and the whole body of the Clergy of the Diocese of Moscow tendered their heartfelt congratulations to the Metropolitan.

But in the midst of pastoral work and cares, old age and bodily ailments already began to tell upon the Most Reverend Innocent. Finally sickness entirely weakened him, when on the 30th of March, 1879, he called to his bedside the house-warden, the Hieromonach Arsenius, that he may read for him the office said at the departure of a soul, and at 2 o'clock, on the morning of the 31st of March (12th of April, New Style), Innocentius had passed away.

"Tell them"—he said, dying—"that no eulogies be pronounced at my funeral; they only contain praise. Let them rather preach a sermon; it may be instructive; and here is the text for it: *'The ways of man are ordered by the Lord.'*"

At 11 o'clock the next day the great bell in the tower of Ivan the Great pealed forth the announcement to the citizens of Moscow, that the Prelate was dead. On the 5th of April the body of the reposed was buried in the ground by the side of the grave of the Metropolitan Philaret in the Troitse—Sergiev Monastery.

And long will Russia remember this great worker, who planted the Faith of Christ among so many Pagan tribes in the most distant and severe countries, truly with saintly patience, with meekness and remarkable humility. For an example of such humility, and such simple words, which are penetrated with pure, fervent faith, we have a small book written by Metropolitan Innocent, and it is: *Showing the Way to the Kingdom of Heaven*. It is pointed out in this splendid book, how we may fulfill the word of the Savior—take the cross and follow Him—how we may receive the Holy Ghost, how we may destroy the wall of sins, which separates us from our Redeemer and the Kingdom of Heaven.



To Innocent of Alaska

*In the realms of God's eternal mansions,
Now thou restest, faithful planter of His missions.
No words of ours can justly honor thee in a praise of rhyme;
On high we look and behold thy halo, truly apostolic and sublime.
Corona of glory, Innocent, teacher of the Aleut, and the Indian's friend!
Ever blessed in the memory of the Kamchadal and the Yakout who by
thee are gladdened.
Note also this gathering and the joy of all thy people on the anniversary
of thy birth;
The Orthodox Church in wide America exults, because thy Alaskan
Diocese gave her birth.*

Monks and Martyrs of the Holy Mountain

Calendar Commemorations as Well as Current Events Make
Mount Athos of Special Present Interest

May 28, Remembrance of all the Venerable Fathers of Mount Athos.

June 4, Remembrance of all the Holy Martyrs of Mount Athos.

—Orthodox Menaion (Julian Dates).....

THESE two days, June tenth and seventeenth in the modern calendar, turn the attention and prayer of Orthodoxy to the Holy Mountain of Athos and the monastic colonies established there. Even more sharply was our mind called to this historic center of the life of the Church by the recent radical revision of its political status. Since the annex to the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920 the Athos communities of monks have formed an integral part of the realm of the Greek Government although locally autonomous and governed by their own council. Politically they were subject to Greece. Ecclesiastically they were entirely independent in fact though technically under the protection of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. But political government was of no consequence within the monastic associations as such even though it was the most absorbing interest of many of the monks who were violent partisans of rival political groups. Within the affairs of the monasteries politics and civil government were alike subject to the religious government of each colony of monks. How great was the measure of independence and authority of the local religious government may be judged from the fact that the monks of Athos felt entirely capable of defying either the Patriarchate of Constantinople or the Greek Government.

The services of the Monks of the Holy Mountain to the Orthodox Church and Faith form an illustrious record centuries long and still unfinished. Future historians of the Church may well count the past three years as one of the periods in which again the Mount Athos Monks have played a leading part in the preservation of Orthodoxy. Their splendid defiance of the attempt of the Greek Government to secularize the monasteries has helped to preserve monastic life and ideals. But greater than this, both in consequences and in the strength and courage required, was the rebuke which the Athos Monks sent to the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople regarding the proposed Œcumenical Council of Orthodoxy. The program for that Council as proposed at Constantinople included the radical revision of the Canon Law of the Church so as to permit the marriage of Bishops and the second marriage of widowed Priests and the renunciation of the monastic vows taken under a certain age. This having been done, it was proposed that the schismatic "Red" Church of Russia with its married Bishops be accepted as Orthodox; and that the Protestant Church of England by law established be declared part of an Orthodox Union regardless of its heresies and absence of Orthodox Sacraments and Orders. Furthermore, to facilitate the union of Protestants with such a bastard orthodoxy, it was proposed that the Service Books of the Orthodox Catholic Church should be so revised as to remove the more extreme and striking examples of Catholic veneration of the Most Holy Mother of God, the Pure and Spotless Virgin Mary. There was much

difficulty in finding a suitable and acceptable place in which to convene the proposed Council. Finally Mount Athos was chosen. Upon this news the Monks of the Holy Mountain rose in revolt. A most curt message was sent from Athos to Constantinople informing the Œcumenical Patriarchate that for the assembling of married, schismatic, and heretical bishops and the discussion of the infamous proposals on the program of the council any other place would be more suitable than the holy and sacred precincts of the monasteries of Mount Athos. This rebuff, with others, and the providential barriers thrown in the way has preserved Orthodoxy, temporarily at least, from being butchered by Protestantism and heretically reforming leaders who favor the sacrifice of Catholic Faith to Protestant influence and support. It is to the undying glory of the Monks of Mount Athos that they have thrown the weight of the Holy Mountain on the side of the defence of Orthodoxy.

What will happen under the new political dispensation on Mount Athos remains to be seen. Under the terms of the new Charter the Monks settle local affairs in their own way and by their own authority. For their internal affairs and local government the communities constitute a republic of monasteries and monks technically under the ecclesiastical authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as before. For their few outside political contacts and relations with secular governments the communities are under the authority of a Prefect Governor of the peninsula. This Governor is appointed by the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs. All residents of the monasteries become Greek citizens and subjects upon entry of the monastic state, regardless of their previous political allegiance. The lands and properties are vested inalienably in the monks and are free from all taxation. For the preservation of order and defence from any possible attack upon the strategic promontory, the Greek Government will keep a force of gendarmes under the orders of the Prefect Governor on Athos.

It is to be hoped that the new arrangement will end the political quarrels and jealousies over the alleged use of Mount Athos as a military base. The Holy Mountain should be enabled to resume its place as the intellectual light of Orthodoxy and the center of piety, devotion, culture and learning in the Eastern Catholic Church. The sympathetic sketch by Mr. James C. Young originally published in the *New York Times* will be of interest to many who know little of Mount Athos and its history. To scholarship and historical research no less than to religion and the Church the preservation of Mount Athos and its monasteries is of utmost importance. In recent years much valuable research has been done among the thousands of unpublished manuscripts reposing in the despoiled libraries of Athos monasteries. What literary, devotional, and historical treasures are yet to be unearthed in forgotten piles and corners no one knows. Certain it is that the fire of religious patriotism and zeal for Orthodoxy that has made the fathers and martyrs of Athos venerable is needed today as never before. No place is more suitable and appropriate for the rekindling of the sacred fire of Orthodox religion and learning than the ancient foundations of Orthodox glory on Mount Athos. Whatever the political disposition of its residents, Athos belongs to the whole of Orthodoxy, irrespective of race or nationality, and will continue to be the center of Orthodoxy's pious yearnings and prayers in all lands and all nations.

Athos Becomes a Tiny Republic

Famous Greek Church Realm, Sacred to Monks and Closed to Women, Has Been for Centuries a Torch Tossed From Hand to Hand

By JAMES C. YOUNG

(Reprinted by special permission of the New York Times)

MOUNT ATHOS has become a monastic republic under control of the Greek Church. Like the Vatican, it will now enjoy almost complete liberty from any rule but its own. Evidently this measure of freedom is to be even larger in the case of Mount Athos, the only independent State maintained by a religious body in the modern world.

Standing on its remote peninsula in the Aegean Sea, this republic of Mount Athos is a real link between the present and the past. The peninsula is about forty miles long and from five to seven miles wide. It presents to the eye a strange and wild grandeur. Over all rises Mount Athos, resembling a pyramid. It reaches an altitude of more than 6,000 feet, its white marble summit rugged and awesome against the blue sky.

Around Mount Athos clusters the lore of more than twenty centuries. All of its legends, its ancient culture, its religious traditions have been inherited by a religious community of about 8,000 men. Some 3,000 are fully accepted monks, distributed among twenty-odd monasteries of a half-dozen nations, the remainder being novices or lay brothers. Heretofore the Serbs and the Russians have maintained hermitages of a decidedly national character, but under the new régime every man who retires to Mount Athos becomes a Greek citizen. Neophytes are drawn from the whole Balkan range, Tiflis, Georgia and the wide sweep of Russia.

Mount Athos stands apart from the modern world. It is one of the last strongholds of medieval times. Its monasteries possess literary treasures that are practically unknown beyond their doorways. Several of the establishments preserve rare examples of Byzantine art. But the most familiar reason for the fame of Mount Athos is an interdiction against women, enforced ever since 1045. No woman may set foot upon the peninsula.

It would be difficult to find another spot more isolated. Toward the west are the sheer slopes of Mount Olympus, antique shrine of the gods. A little to the east are the plains of Troy. Across the Aegean Sea came every enemy that the East unleashed against Hellenic culture. The peninsula itself bears traces of what is said to be the canal cut by Xerxes before he invaded Hellas. And this is the same Mount Athos that Dinocrates, the architect, offered to make over into a statue of Alexander holding a city in one hand and in the other a flowing spring. Zeus had a temple here. Legend affirms, and with considerable probability, that the rocky peninsula was at one time a haven for free-thinkers.

But the principal fame of Mount Athos began after the Christian era. According to the traditions of its monasteries the first religious settlements took place in the age of Constantine, 274-337 A. D., and there is always the fascinating prospect of uncovering some document in the monastical archives to support this view. At present the world possesses no written evidence to show that the community existed before the ninth century.

In 969 St. Athanasius established the great monastery of Laura, which still remains, its architecture including work of every century since then. The Byzantine predominates and it would take a practical eye indeed accurately to divide the centuries reflected here. At that period Greece was a Byzantine province, ruled from Byzantium, the modern Constantinople. The old Hellenic culture was in sad straits—yet the Byzantine had sprung from this eternal fountain. Since the fall of Rome barbarians of many races had overrun the country, despoiling and destroying. Much that the Romans had left behind was willfully shattered. Then came Byzantine rule and something like security.

The pride of Hellas—a flame never extinguished—burned through the dross. Here and there the Hellenic spirit uplifted the torch; and the monastery of Laura soon lighted the lands roundabout as a beacon of this spirit. To the Greece of a thousand years ago it was a kind of Jerusalem or Mecca, to which all eyes turned. Other monasteries were erected. The peninsula then bore its ancient name, Acte, only the peak being called Mount Athos.

Succeeding Emperors of Byzantium took a lively interest in this development of a "holy mountain," as the name signifies. Byzantium adhered to the Greek Church, and the ruling head of that body, the Patriarch, was an efficient arm of Byzantine rule and lived in the capital. Evidently there was some doubt about the utility of a "holy mountain" that might exercise a new influence. Whatever the cause, it was determined that Mount Athos should be a rigidly restricted monastic body. In 1045 the Emperor Constantine Monomachos excluded "female creatures" forever from the monastic precincts. Other rules were provided for its conduct and certain liberties granted.

Adverse currents of political rule and religious independence reached another phase in 1060, when the Patriarch lost his authority over the Mount and the first monastic free state was founded by imperial edict. Unfortunately, the train of events in the next few centuries is so blurred that even the monasteries must rely upon tradition for a connected story.

It is certain that a Latin invasion of Byzantium in 1204 caused distress to the monks, and Pope Innocent III commiserated with them. The next two centuries brought a larger prosperity, new monasteries and wide prestige. Several of the Byzantine Emperors retired at times to the cloisters for meditation and guidance. But this golden period led to another dark phase.

About the end of the fourteenth century there is reason to believe that the religious establishments had a store of early church writings and remnants of classical papyri. Then the era of the Turks brought the darkness that settled upon Mount Athos and the rest of the Hellenic world.

Long before Byzantium fell the monks had been forced to obey the Turk. But the Turks were somewhat kinder to Mount Athos than to most of the Hellenic lands.

Nearly 500 years passed before Turkish rule was thrown off. Modern Greeks speak of that period as "The Turkish Night"—pronounced with a gesture. Throughout this time the beacon of Mount Athos burned, the inspiration of an enslaved people. Through the long Middle Ages Mount Athos and Greece continued in a world that was neither medieval Europe nor Byzantium, but an Oriental half-world, where the two orders met, but never mingled. In these five centuries the monks labored for their people with high devotion. Finally, in 1821, a Greek priest raised

aloft the banner of revolt and led his countrymen through martyrdom to liberty.

This period introduced new woes for the monasteries. Turkish troops held the mountain and used its classical papyri as gun wadding. Imperial manifestos bearing the names of Byzantine emperors a thousand years dead served for campfires. The monks looked on and wept—such of them as were left—for the larger number were in the field against their enemy. It is cause for surprise that anything survived the havoc. Yet much escaped, and the great libraries of Moscow and Paris have invaluable documents from the mountain collections, and the monasteries themselves retain their share.

With the coming of Greek independence in 1829, the monks returned to something like their ancient peace. They held considerable grants of land in several countries; notably Rumania; but in 1864 their Rumanian estates were secularized by the Rumanian Government, greatly diminishing the monastic revenues.

Since that time various mishaps have visited the mountains. In 1891 a fire destroyed the library of Simopetra, and in 1905 that of St. Paul went the same way. The latter year also brought an earthquake, which damaged the buildings.

Yet each fresh calamity has left something behind it. Mount Athos, after a thousand years of recorded history and another thousand years preserved in legend, is a unique community. Aside from the monastery Laura, its principal establishments are the monastery of Vatopedi, supposedly founded by the Byzantine Emperor, Theodosius III, in the eighth century; the Russian monastery of St. Panteleimon, usually called the Rossikon, dating from the twelfth century, and the Serbian monastery, of that century as well, Chiliandari. Others are the Iveron, founded by Georgians, and the monasteries of St. Paul, St. Denis, St. Gregory, Simopetra and St. Xenophon.

There is something more than would appear in the new regulation that every man repairing to the community must become a Greek citizen. Before the World War the Rossikon was perhaps the largest and wealthiest of the monasteries. Its abbots bought land wherever available and added many sturdy brothers to the community. Neighbors charged that they really were soldiers and that the Rossikon was an outpost to aid in the seizure of Constantinople for the Czar.

Since the war old fears have disappeared to some extent. But Russia's interest in Constantinople continues, as does the interest of Greece—every Greek considers himself the lineal heir to that famed city. Hence, new Greece apparently has no intention of letting new Russia use the mountain for an outpost.

These plans lead naturally to consideration of the Greek priest's relation to modern thought. It might be said that religion is a habit of the Greek mind without any particular evidences of deep veneration. By nature and inheritance the Greek must ever be something of a philosopher. Ordinarily he attends church and treats his priesthood with respect, but has definite ideas of his own upon religious matters.

This tendency was indicated under the recent Government of General Pangalos, a man fond of edicts and never tired of finding reasons for issuing them. One morning Athens awoke to learn that the monasteries henceforth would be closed against neophytes. No more monks were wanted in the body politic. Nor was this the full extent of the

edict. Every monastery inmate under 40 must exchange his robe for a job. Greece probably has as many churches and as many priests as any other nation. A large part of its people go regularly to services, and the religious festivals are zealously observed. Yet the edict of Pangalos aroused little if any resentment. It was accepted with stoical calm. Ordinarily the Greek mind is quick to take the spark and swift to catch the flame. But Pangalos said all monks under 40 must go to work and that no more would be admitted to the monasteries. And his countrymen acquiesced.

Then the overthrow of Pangalos left the monks in an undetermined state. Presumably they are to go on as in the past and Mount Athos seems in a fair way to regain its ancient greatness. It is the sacred place of Greece, where the devout dream of going at least once in their lives to commune with holy men. A pilgrimage to Mount Athos puts the seal of devotion on a layman's career. Greek priests the world around travel to Mount Athos, for it is the goal of their spiritual ambition.



News, Notes, and Comments

PRIVATE advices from Russia state that His Eminence, the Metropolitan Sergius, Substitute Locum Tenens or Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne of Moscow and All-Russia during the confinement of the Locum Tenens, His Eminence, Metropolitan Peter, has been released from prison by the Soviet authorities. Whether or not His Eminence Metropolitan Sergius will reassume the direction of the Patriarchal Office in place of the present incumbent is not known.

* * * * *

News from Constantinople and from Paris is to the effect that the Œcumenical Patriarchate has issued an official letter from the Patriarch of Constantinople definitely recognizing His Eminence Metropolitan Evlogius as the rightful authority over the Russian churches in Europe outside Russia and His Eminence Metropolitan Platon as the corresponding rightful Head of the Russian Church in North America. This, presumably, is the reply of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the appeal of the Synod of Russian Bishops at Karlovitz in Serbia for recognition of the authority which they claim for themselves. The Russian churches in Europe are badly divided over the question of whether the Karlovitz Synod or the Metropolitan Evlogius who was appointed by the late Patriarch Tikhon should exercise authority over them. In London the two factions use the church on alternate Sundays. It is to be hoped that the convention of Bishops and Clergy shortly to be called in Paris by Metropolitan Evlogius will be able to reach some solution of the difficulty.

* * * * *

A Russian Church Calendar recently published in Europe gives some interesting figures on the religious situation in Russia according to the latest information obtainable. Before the War the Russian census of local religious organizations showed fifty-two thousand active local congregations of which forty-two thousand were Orthodox Catholic. The present Soviet enumeration shows a total of 33,696 local religious organizations in Soviet Russia. Of these eighty per cent or less than twenty-eight thousand are Orthodox Catholic. Six per cent. or about two thousand are Roman Catholic. Six per cent. are Mohammedan. Five per

and finisher of faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. (Hebr. XII, 2, 3.) Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps. (1 Pet. II, 21.)

The Afflicted: My heart is sore pained within me: and the terrors of death are fallen upon me. (Ps. LV, 4.) My Rock, Why hast thou forgotten me? (Ps. XLII, 9.) Hide not thine ear att my breathing, at my cry. (Lament III, 56.)

The Voice of God: Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. I, the Lord, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer. (Ps. XLIX, 15, 26.) As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you. (Ps. LXVI, 13.) Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. (Matt. XI, 28.)

The Afflicted: How long, O Lord, wilt thou hide Thy face from me? How long shall I take counsel in my soul, having sorrow in my heart daily? (Ps. XIII, 1, 2.) Mine eye mourneth by reason of aqiction. Thy fierce wrath goeth over me. Lord, why castest thou off my soul? Why hidest thou thy face from me? (Ps. LXXXVIII, 9, 16, 15.)

The Voice of God: For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee. (Ps. LIV, 8.)

The Afflicted: Awake, why sleepest thou, O LORD? Wherefore hidest thou thy face, and forgettest our affliction and our oppression? Arise for our help. (Ps. XIV, 23, 24, 27.)

The Voice of God: Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. (Ps. XLI, 10.)

The Afflicted: Be not far from me, for trouble is near; for there is none to help. (Ps. XXII, 11.) But I am poor and needy; thou art my help and my deliverer; make no tarrying, O my God. (Ps. XL, 17.)

The Voice of God: Fear not; thou art mine. When thou passeth through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. (Ps. XLIII, 1, 2.)

The Afflicted: Consider and hear me, O LORD my God; lighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death (Ps. XIII, 3) and I go down into the grave mourning. (Gen. XXXVII, 35.)

The Voice of God: I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. Believest thou this? (John, XI, 25, 26.)

The Afflicted: Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God! (John XI, 27.) Thou art my strength; into thine hand I commit my spirit. (Ps. XXXI, 4, 5.) Thy will be done. (Matt. VI, 10.) Be it unto me according to thy word. (Luke I, 38.) Thou hast holden me by my right hand, and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. (Ps. LXXIII, 23, 25.)

From the Book

"To All the Afflicted: for Consolation." p. 7-13. "Troitzkaya Lavra," 1902.
 "L. T." translator; King James Version used for Scripture passages.

EDITORIAL

A Correction

Much comment has been caused by an unfortunate typographical error that slipped into our last number. On Page 118, in the *Editorial Note* inserted in the article on "Old Catholic and Related Groups in America," we quoted a letter written by Archbishop de Landas. The date of this letter was erroneously printed as April 11, 1927, whereas it should have been April 11, 1917. Archbishop de Landas has been dead some years so that the fact of an error was obvious. We have compared the original letter in our possession with the printed quotation in the REVIEW for March and find the quotation entirely correct with the sole exception of the year given in the date of the letter. We regret this misprint and trust that this correction of it will relieve the minds of those who were disturbed by our inadvertently dating the quotation a month later than the date of our magazine and years later than the death of its writer. We are glad, however, that no more serious error than that of the changed date occurred in this important *Editorial Note*.

To the Russian Students and the Orthodox Student Movement

The recent convention of Russian Students gathered from American colleges was most encouraging. The higher education of our Orthodox Catholic Youth in America so that they shall be able to take wise and intelligent leadership when it is passed on to them is of the utmost importance. Both the Church and the Nation in America must depend on the college boys and girls of today to lead and direct tomorrow. The Russian youth loyal to the needs and call of his father's fatherland will find in a few years that the world's greatest need is for trained Orthodox Christian leadership, direction, and workmanship in the rebuilding of Russia as the world's greatest Christian Empire. That task, on which to a large degree the future of our culture and civilization depends, can only be done rightly and effectively by Russian Orthodox youth. Unto the boys and girls, the young men and women, of Russian parentage and heritage in America and Western Europe today there will come in a few short years the problem of New Russia. They alone can meet and deal with that problem. How they handle it will determine the future of the world.

In the present disaster that has fallen upon Russia in the travail of her passage from medieval simplicity to modern mechanical complexity of life the one binding force and power that has remained as a bridge from the old to the new is the Orthodox Catholic Church and Faith. Even as in the Dark Ages of culture in Western Europe, so in this night of Russia's re-birth, the Church is the preserver and guardian of all that is good in the past and the Mother and patron of all the good that the future holds for civilization. Loyalty and support for the true Orthodox Catholic Church, and for Her alone and undefiled by admixture with alien and disruptive creeds and religious bodies, is the supreme duty of

all the Christian youth who would prepare to serve the Russia of the future or preserve the values of the Russia of the past.

The various Protestant bodies dream of control of the religion of Russia of tomorrow. The Baptist attempts to capture Russia are assuming ever larger proportions. The Methodists hope that their support of the Soviet Living Church and their sending teachers into its seminaries and editors to its publications will effect a Methodist Reformation of Russia's Religion. The Protestant Episcopal and Church of England (that efficient "arm of the English Civil Service" as former Premier Lloyd George termed the Protestant Church of England) hopes to absorb Russian Orthodoxy into a Pan-Protestant Union of which the Anglicans would be the center. Not one of these Protestant dreams can preserve or help the Orthodox Catholic Church, the Faith and Religion of the Russian People. Let no agents of subtle propaganda deceive our Orthodox Youth into the belief that such proposals deserve the support of the Orthodoxy they betray and deny secretly. The duty of Russian Orthodox students is to preserve and develop their own Orthodox Catholic Church, not to unite with the alien and divided heresies of Anglican, Protestant Episcopal, Methodist, and Baptist sects. Let us remain true to Orthodoxy in order that we may be true to Russia in her hour of need when she shall be delivered from her present travail.

Truth and Apologies

We regret that the tender feelings of many people appear to have been hurt by articles and Editorial comment and notes that have been published in the REVIEW. That the REVIEW should give offense or injure anyone's feelings is far from our intent or desire. However, there seem to be persons and bodies who take offense and feel injured if the truth be spoken plainly and dispassionately. We can make no apologies for the truth, nor does truth need any apology, regardless of the extent of injury to the feelings of those who take offense thereat.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Special Subscription Rate to Clergy and Clubs

Following the custom common to many Religious Periodicals, we are glad to announce that the REVIEW offers a reduced subscription rate to the Clergy (of whatever religious connection). Also that the same reduction is offered to clubs of ten or more subscriptions sent in at one time by any one person or organization. This reduced price is Four Dollars a year instead of the regular Five Dollar rate. Those Clergy who have already subscribed at the regular rate will receive the REVIEW for fifteen instead of twelve issues. This reduced rate will also apply to newspapers, libraries, schools, and colleges. We want to call especial attention to the remarkable offers on the next page. On all of these we offer the Clergy a reduction of One Dollar below the price named.

An Opportunity for Our Readers

WE have made special arrangements whereby we are enabled to offer our readers some unusual magazine bargains. By taking advantage of any of these offers you not only are able to take care of your reading needs, but you effect a substantial saving. In ordering please order by club number. The clergy may secure any club below at one dollar less than our price named.

			<i>Reg. Price</i>	<i>Our Price</i>	<i>Your Saving</i>
No. 1	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	\$9.00	\$8.00	\$1.00
	With Review of Reviews	1 yr.			
No. 2	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	6.50	5.50	1.00
	With Pictorial Review	1 yr.			
No. 3	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	13.00	11.00	2.00
	With World's Work	1 yr.			
	Scribners	1 yr.			
No. 4	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	15.00	12.00	3.00
	With American Mercury	1 yr.			
	Forbes Magazine	1 yr.			
No. 5	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	9.50	8.50	1.00
	With Youth's Companion	1 yr.			
	Children	1 yr.			
No. 6	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	10.00	8.00	2.00
	With Radio News	1 yr.			
	Science & Invention	1 yr.			
No. 7	THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW	1 yr.	16.00	13.00	3.00
	With The Dial	1 yr.			
	The Flower Grower	1 yr.			
	World's Work	1 yr.			

THE ORTHODOX CATHOLIC REVIEW

345 State Street,
Brooklyn, New York.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed please find my check or Money Order for \$.....

for which kindly enter my subscription for Club No.

Name

Street

City..... State.....

1-988 Accep. Chr.

2-1589 - Park. Rule

3-1721 - Synodal

4-1917 Nov. 5. 1925

5-1920 May Self

6-1926 Aug. 30-1925



3 2400 00438 4206

Established 1905

George Papageorge Co.

Orthodox Church Decorators
Artists and Jewelers

All Work Done in Our Own Shop

Reasonable Prices

Prompt Service

Ask for Catalog

618 Eighth Ave. (Near 40th St.) New York

Telephone Lackawanna 6399

Our Advertisers

ADVERTISEMENTS appearing in The Orthodox Catholic Review are highly selected, and represent only such firms as are personally known to the Orthodox Bishops and to our Editors through long and satisfactory relations and reliable service.

We can assure our readers and especially the Orthodox Clergy and Parish Committees that their peculiar needs will be met satisfactorily, courteously, and with experienced efficiency if they give their patronage to those firms having the endorsement of this magazine. We ask that The Orthodox Catholic Review be mentioned in writing advertisers.

Reliable dealers in goods needed by Clergy and Churches have an exclusive medium through which to reach the untouched field of Orthodox Catholic buyers of Church Goods, Altar Wines, Candles, etc., in the pages of the Orthodox Catholic Review. This is the only publication in English which reaches the Orthodox Catholic Clergy and Church people as a whole. This magazine goes to the Orthodox Priest and his Parish with the official endorsement of their Bishop. Only approved advertisers with recommendation of Orthodox Clerical patronage will be accepted.



Charles Belous, Inc.

*For Twenty Years
Manufacturers of*

Truly Orthodox
Church Goods

in

Russian Art Work

205 East Ninth Street
New York City